

---

# Imprimatur

Liber cui Titulus, *A Treatise of*  
Reginald Peacock, &c.  
*Guil. Needham*, R. B. in  
Christo P. ac D. D.  
*Wilhelm. Archiep.* à sac.  
Dom. &c.

Jan. 11,  
1687.

---

---

# Imprimatur

Liber cui Titulus, *A Treatise of*  
Reginald Peacock, &c.  
*Guil. Needham*, R. B. in  
Christo P. ac D. D.  
*Wilhelm. Archiep.* à sac.  
Dom. &c.

Jan. 11,  
1687.

---



A  
T R E A T I S E  
P R O V I N G  
S C R I P T U R E  
To be the  
Rule of Faith.

---

W R I T B Y  
R E G I N A L D P E A C O C K,  
Bishop of CHICHESTER, before the  
R E F O R M A T I O N,  
About the Year MCDL.  
*Publiſh'd By M<sup>r</sup> Wharton*

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed for *James Adamſon*, at the Angel and Crown  
in S. Paul's Church-Yard. 1688.

THE HATFIELD

PROVING

SCOTTISH

John of Galt

Bishop of Winchester, before

REFORMATION

About the Year MCDL.

LONDON

Printed for James Atkinson, at the Angel and Crown  
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1688.

# PREFACE.

**I**F in any part of the Christian Religion an undoubted Certainty and most firm Assurance may justly be required; if a scrupulous Examination and curious Enquiry may ever be allowed in Matters of Religion; certainly an exact Knowledge of the *Rule of Faith* will deserve as our first, so our chief, Consideration. For since the Articles of Christianity are not in themselves self-evident; nor can be found out by the sole principles of Reason; since all revealed Religions are no farther credible, than as they can demonstrate their Revelation to have been true and real, some Rule was necessary, which might propose to Mankind those Articles of Faith which Reason could not suggest, and propose them also with such evidence, as that the denial of assent should in all become irrational.

What this determinate Rule is, hath been the great Controversie of this and all preceding Ages. However, all parties agree in affixing some certain properties to it, whereby it may be distinguished; and indeed without which it can never supply the Office, or serve the ends of a true Rule. These may be reduced to four Heads, That it be able safely and inviolably to convey down all revealed necessary Truths: That it be fitted to propose them clearly and invariably to all Mankind: That it be independent on all other revealed Articles: And lastly, that it be assigned as a Rule by God, the Author of all  
A revealed

## P R E F A C E.

revealed Religion. If either of the two first Conditions be deficient, the Rule will be unuseful; if either of the latter, uncertain and without authority.

The Scripture enjoys all these properties in so eminent a manner, that no reasonable Doubt can be made of the Truth of it. For if we consider, that whatsoever is revealed, may be pronounced; whatsoever is pronounced, may be written down; and whatsoever is committed to Writing may be preserved safe, while those Writings are preserved unaltered; we must conclude, that any revealed Religion may be intirely, and without danger of mistake, proposed from written Books to the universal Belief of Mankind, since these will afford a standing Rule both to Pastors of teaching of their People, and to the People of examining the Doctrine of their Pastors, in case of Diffidence. The independence of Scripture from all other revealed Articles is no less evident. For that these Books were indeed written by those persons whose names they bear, and these persons highly credible, is known by the same evidences whereby the Authors, and Credibility of any other Books are known; I mean by the concurrent testimony and consent of all succeeding Ages, considered not as a Collection of Men professing the Christian Faith, but as persons devoid neither of common sense, nor integrity, as they must have been, if they had mistaken themselves, or deluded us in believing, and then testifying a matter of fact so easy to be known, and more easy to be remembered. Being thus assured of the Credibility of Scripture, that it was written by such Historians, who really, either performed, or saw those Miracles which they do attest, we cannot but believe these Miracles; and consequently, that the Authors and  
Founders

## P R E F A C E.

Founders of the Christian Religion acted by a Divine Commission, and may reasonably command our assent to their Revelations. Being thus assured of the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, we may probably conclude from the nature and end of them, but most certainly from their own Testimony, that they contain all things necessary to Salvation, and are the only Rule of Faith: and all this although we did not yet believe any other Article of the Christian Religion.

On the other side, Tradition wants every one of those Conditions which are necessarily required to a Rule of Faith. For first we can never be assured, that any Articles were invariably and intirely without any addition or diminution conveyed down to us by Tradition; since it hath been in all Times and Ages observed, that Matters of Fact, much more of Belief, not immediately committed to Writing, presently degenerated into Fables, and were corrupted by the capricious Malice or Ignorance of Men. Nothing can exempt the Tradition of the Christian Religion from this Fate, at least from our reasonable suspicions of it, but the Infallibility of that Society of Men which conveys down this Tradition. But the latter can never be known till this certainty of Tradition be first cleared and presupposed, since the Belief of this supposed Infallibility, must at last be resolved into the sole truth and certainty of Tradition.

In the next place, Tradition cannot certainly and invariably propose the Belief of Christianity to all private persons. For from whence shall this Tradition be received? from a Pope, or a Council, or both, or from none of these, but only the Universal Church?



## P R E F A C E.

In every one of these Cases infinite difficulties will occur, which will singly appear insuperable: As, who is a true Pope, what his intentions in defining were, whether he acted Canonically, in what sense he hath defined? What Councils, whether Oecumenical, Patriarchal or Provincial may be securely trusted? What are the necessary Conditions and Qualifications of a General Council? Whether all these Conditions were ever observed in any Council? What these Councils are, what they have defined, what is the true sense and intention of their Definitions? From whom must we learn the Belief of the Universal Church, if Popes and Councils be rejected? From all Christians, or only from the Clergy? If from the latter, whether the assent of every member of the Clergy be required? If not, how great a part may safely dissent from the rest? From whom the opinion of the major part is to be received? Whether from the Writings of Doctors, or the teaching of living Pastors? If from the latter, whether it be sufficient to hear one or a few Parish Priests, or all, or at least the major number are personally to be consulted? All these Difficulties may be branched out into many more, and others, no less insuperable, be found out; which will render the Proposal of Religion by way of Tradition, if not utterly impracticable, at least, infinitely unsafe.

Thirdly, Tradition is so far from being independent on other Articles of the Christian Faith, that the Belief of all other Articles must be presupposed to it. For since all Sects propose different Traditions, and the truth of none of them is self-evident, it must first be known which is the true Church, before

## P R E F A C E.

Before it can be determined which is the true Tradition. Now the knowledge of the true Church can be obtained only two ways, either from the Truth of her Doctrines, or from the external Notes of a true Church. If the first way, then it must first be known what are the true and genuine Doctrines of Christianity, the stedfast belief of which causeth this Society to become the true Church. But if the true Church be known only from some external Notes, these Notes are either taught by Scripture, or found out by the light of Reason. If taught by Scripture, then the knowledge of the Divine Authority of Scripture is antecedent to the knowledge of the true Church, and consequently independent on it. For otherwise Scripture will be believed for the Authority of the Church, and the Church for the Authority of Scripture: which is a manifest Circle. Besides, in this case that grand Article of Belief in the Holy Catholick Church will be received not from Tradition, but from the Scripture: and consequently Scripture, not Tradition, will be the primary Rule of Faith. Lastly, if the Notes of the Church may be found out by Natural Reason, then to pass by the infinite Contradictions which would arise from such a Proposition, these Notes can be no other than Antiquity, Universality, Perpetuity, and such like; every one of which doth some way or other presuppose the knowledge of the true Doctrines of Christianity, as well as those of the present Church. For the end of these Notes is to compare the former with the latter: and consequently both of them must be first known.

Lastly,

## P R E F A C E.

Lastly, It can never be proved that Tradition was assigned by God as a Rule of Faith. For this proof must be taken either from the Scriptures, or from Tradition. Not from the first, for not to say, that Scripture is wholly silent in this matter, such a supposition would destroy it self, and involves a manifest Contradiction. For if it be a Point of Faith that Tradition is the Rule of Faith, and this Article is deduced and received only from Scripture; then Scripture is the immediate Rule of one Article of Faith, and the mediate Rule of all other Articles; and consequently Tradition cannot be the Rule of Faith. No less absurd is it to imagine any Proof of this Article can be drawn from Tradition. For we can never be assured, the Tradition of this very Article is of Divine Authority, and consequently infallible, until we be first satisfied, that God, by assigning Tradition for a Rule of Faith, conferred Divine Authority upon it, which is the matter now in question.

Thus have I briefly pointed out some Arguments, which prove that Tradition neither is, nor can be the Rule of Faith. And indeed all Ages of Christianity have been so far satisfied of the truth of this, that in all Controversies the Catholicks no less constantly appealed to Scripture, than the Hereticks recurred to Tradition. The pretence of Tradition is so easie, and impossible to be refuted by the meaner Christians, that, no wonder if Hereticks always took this more compendious way, when to pretend the Authority of Scripture, would have been too palpable and too gross an impudence. The Standard of written Truths continued always the same, and could not be universally corrupted. Whereas Tradition

## P R E F A C E.

dition might securely be adapted to the most absurd and contrary Opinions; since to effect that Design no more was required, than the confidence or mistake of Hereticks, pretending to have received their own Dreams and Errors, as necessary Articles of Faith, from their Forefathers. Thus all the Hereticks of the three first Centuries, when the true and genuine Tradition of the Church might much more easily be known, than it can be at this day, proposed their Heresies under the venerable name of *Apostolick Traditions*; which pretence they carried on so far, that they published the *Παράδοξις*, or Traditions of almost every Apostle and Apostolick Man, wherein they committed to Writing those revealed Truths, which they believed the Apostles to have preached, and have left unwritten. In vain should the Fathers and Writers of the Church have recurred to the true and genuine Tradition of unwritten Revelations, since they could never demonstrate, that this true Tradition was rather to be found among them, than among those Hereticks. For many of these Heretical Sects were contemporary with, or began immediately after the Apostles, were vastly numerous, and scattered through the whole Church; and consequently could put in so fair a claim for Tradition, that no human wit could ever have determined the Question, if the Scripture had not been called in, and opposed to such unreasonable pretensions. Accordingly Scripture was ever pleaded by the Catholicks, and the pretence of unwritten Revelations derived down by oral Tradition was then esteemed as a Characteristick Note of Hereticks. Thus *S. Augustin*\*, and before him *Clemens Alexandrinus* †, † *Lib. Strom. passim.* complain of the Hereticks of their times; *Tertulian* || assures us, it was the usual evasion of Hereticks, *Heret.*

\* *Tract. in Joan. 96, 97.*  
† *Lib. Strom. passim.*  
|| *De Præscript. Heret.*

# P R E F A C E.

to decline the Scriptures, and flee to Tradition, pretending, that the Apostles published not the Gospel to all People, nor committed all revealed Truths to Writing, but delivered many Articles of Faith secretly to approved Men; which Articles were no other than their own Heresies. In the same manner the Hereticks, opposed by S. Irenæus\*, were wont, when urged with the Authority of Scripture, and their perfect silence as to those Articles which they obtruded upon the World, to plead the Imperfection of the Holy Scriptures, that they were not intended by

\* Lib. 3. cap. 2.  
lib. 2. cap. 3.

*Quia non possit ex his (S. Scripturis) inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciunt Traditionem. Non enim per literas traditam illam sed per vivam vocem. Ibid.*

God as a Rule of Faith, *Because the Truth could not be learned from them by those who were ignorant of Tradition. For that the Christian Faith was not delivered by Writing, but by*

*Word of Mouth, or by Oral Tradition.*

To produce but one Example more, Eunomius the Heretick in his Apology extant in Manuscript in S. Martin's Library, every where pleadeth the Tradition of precedent Ages, and professeth to follow that as his only Rule of Faith. *It*

† Αναρχῶν δ' ὡς τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων ποιούμεναι τὴν κρατῆσαν ἐγώδεν ἐκ τῶν πατέρων ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς ὡς περ τινα γνώμονα καὶ κανόνα ὡς ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀποδοῦναι τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν πατέρων ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆς. Apologetic. in fine Prologi. Τὴν τῶν ἀγίων ἐκ τῆς ἀποστολῆς διδασκαλίαν, παρ' ἧς ἐν καὶ δόντες—πνεύματος ἀγίου. Post medium.

*is necessary (saith he †) for those who treat of matters of Faith, setting before them the holy Tradition, which hath all along obtained from the times of the Fathers, as a Rule and Canon, to make use of this accurate Rule to judge of those things which shall be said. Afterwards proposing his bla-*

*sphemous Opinion about the Holy Ghost, he introduceth it with this Preface, Exactly following the Doctrine of the Holy Fathers, and receiving it from them, we believe, &c.*

This



This then was the Artifice and Practice of the ancient Hereticks. What the Practice of the Catholick Fathers was in opposing these Hereticks, or establishing any necessary Article of Faith; that they accounted Scripture to be the only adequate Rule of Faith, and to contain in express and plain words all things necessary to be believed; that they rejected all Articles, which could not be thence deduced, as spurious and false, or at least uncertain and unnecessary; and always asserted the Sufficiency of Scripture, I will not here insist to prove; since that Point hath been so often handled and cleared by the Writers of our Church, more particularly *\* Dissuasive from Popery. Par. 2. lib. 1. Sect. 2.* by Bishop Taylor \*, to whom I remit the Reader.

My Design and the Age of that Treatise which I now publish, require me to descend lower, and demonstrate, that even in latter Ages it was the commonly received Opinion of the Church, that Scripture is the Rule of Faith. And this alone will as evidently overthrow the Plea of Tradition, as if the Consent of all Ages herein were demonstrated. For since Tradition is the perpetual Succession of any Doctrine conveyed down in the Church by word of mouth from the Apostles to this present time; if this Succession were in any Age whatsoever interrupted, it can no more claim the Title of Tradition than if it had never been believed. So that if it can be proved, the Doctrine of Tradition, being the Rule of Faith, was in any Age of the Church disbelieved, not only the proof of this Article from Tradition will fail; but even the Article it self will appear to be evidently false. For it is not possible that Tradition should be the

B

Rule

# P R E F A C E.

Rule of Faith, if that very Article, that Tradition is the Rule of Faith, were not delivered down by an uninterrupted succession of Belief: for then it would not be the Rule of that very Article. Besides, it is absurd, that the Church of any Age should have power of declaring what the Tradition of Faith is, and consequently of fixing the Rule of Faith, and yet be so far from being conscious of any such power inherent in her, that she disbelieved it. Not to say, that if at any time Tradition was not believed by the Church to be the Rule of Faith, and yet at the same time divers Articles of Faith were defined by the Church, Tradition must necessarily ever since have ceased to be the Rule of Faith; since otherwise all Definitions of the Church must indifferently be admitted, made by her both when she followed, and when she deviated from the Rule of Faith; and consequently the Faith of all private Christians must be subjected to infinite uncertainty.

Now to prove that the Tradition of this Article was in any Age of the Church interrupted and discontinued, it is not necessary, that all members of the Church should then agree in the disbelief of it, that no Doctors should believe Tradition to be the Rule of Faith, or none maintain the Insufficiency of Scripture. It is sufficient, that some Divines of great name, who lived and died in the Communion of the Church, were ever held in great esteem both for Piety and Learning, and never censured by the Church for any erroneous Opinions, much less for Hereticks, that some such, I say, disbelieved this Article, and maintained Scri-

Scripture to be the Rule of Faith. For if any such were, then the contrary Opinion could not be the belief of the universal Church, much less an Article of Faith. That there were such Doctors I shall immediately prove, by producing their own Words, and thereby demonstrate my intended purpose. And not only so, but farther shall therewith render it highly probable, that it was the generally received Opinion of the Church at that time, that Scripture, not Tradition, is the Rule of Faith, by all those Arguments, which a question of this Nature will admit, I mean by the authority of the most eminent Writers, and publick practice of the Church in Councils. For it cannot be imagined, that so many Learned Persons, esteemed, as it were, the Oracles of their Times, and Pillars of the Church, should either be ignorant of the Doctrine of the Church, touching the Fundamental Principle of Faith, or if willfully opposing it, should obtain, or conserve to themselves so great a Reputation; or that the General Councils of that time should, in their Sessions and Disputations, permit the Sufficiency of Scripture to be laid down as an uncontroverted Principle, without giving some check to so grand an Error.

That the Church therefore in the fifteenth Age did generally believe the Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, and contain all things necessary to Salvation, may be evidently demonstrated from this Treatise which I now publish. The Author of which was far the most Eminent and Learned Bishop of the Church of *England* in his time; a person, who, as himself assures us, had spent more

## P R E F A C E.

than twenty years in writing Controversial Books against the Lollards, when he composed this Treatise; and who every where giveth manifest proof of his great Learning. So eminent a person cannot be supposed to have been ignorant of the general Belief of the Church in his time, concerning the Rule of Faith; nor will his apparent zeal for the Interest of the Church, permit us to believe, that he wilfully opposed the Doctrine of the Church, in whose Service he employed the greatest part of his life; or that when he so zealously pleaded the Cause of the Church against the Lollards, he should himself depart from the Church in her principal Article, and therein become a Lollard. Since therefore he plainly asserts and teacheth, that Scripture is the Rule of Faith, this undeniably proves, that the belief of this Proposition, was not, in the time of our Author, accounted any part of Lollardism, or supposed Heresie; but rather esteemed an Article of Catholick Belief, at least, an Article which might be freely disputed, without violating the Definitions, or dissenting from the universal Belief of the Church. And indeed our Author in the beginning of this Discourse assureth us, that the Doctors of his time disagreed in determining, whether the Church or Scripture were chiefly to be respected in the resolution of Faith.

One thing may be objected against the Authority of our Author; That he was forced, by the ruling Clergy, to recant several Opinions and Doctrines taught by him, as erroneous; and consequently, that he cannot be esteemed a Doctor of the Church. But here not to say, that the sentence of two or  
three

three partial Bishops (for no more condemned him) is not to be accounted the Judgment of the Church of *England*, this very Recantation addeth no small strength to our Argument. For when the malice of his Enemies obliged him to recant all those Doctrines which they esteemed to be erroneous, they took no notice of his having asserted Scripture to be the only Rule of Faith, nor obliged him to recant that Proposition; a manifest Argument that it was not then accounted either heretical or erroneous, or contrary to the received Doctrine of the Church; since otherwise they would not have failed to place it in the front of his Recantation, as an Error of an higher degree, and greater contagion, than any of those for which he stood condemned; which, in truth, were so far from being Heresies, that they were all at that time maintained by many eminent Divines, who never were censured by the Church, and some of them so far true, that no Learned Man of the Church of *Rome* will at this day deny them. And this also fully clears our Author from any suspicion of *Lollardism*, or secret inclination to it.

That he was not singular herein, defended no Paradox, nor opposed any Doctrine of the Church; I come next to prove: The School Divinity was at that time universally received in the Church of *Rome*, taught in all Universities and Schools, and by long use become in great measure the Doctrine of the Church. The most famous and celebrated Author of this Divinity was *S. Thomas Aquinas*, whose Writings were then in all Mens hands, universally applauded, and religiously embraced. Some few Divines indeed



indeed dissented from him, and followed the System of *Scotus*; but this Disagreement respected not the Rule of Faith, nor indeed any material point of Divinity, but only some abstracted Notions and Scholastick Niceties of Divinity. The Doctrine therefore of *Aquinas* is to be esteemed the general opinion of the Divines and Writers of those times. It cannot be here objected against the force of our Argument, that the same Divinity is yet retained and taught in most Popish Countries, although the Doctrine of the Scriptures Sufficiency be rejected. The Method of Reasoning and Disputing is now infinitely altered among the Writers of the Roman Church from what it was before the Reformation. Before that time they made no difficulty to acknowledge and even urge the necessity of Reformation; whereas now the Honour of their Church obligeth them to declare it both unnecessary and unlawful. While Scripture was yet locked up in an unknown Tongue, and removed from the knowledge of the Laity, (who were then generally very ignorant) they were not ashamed to make confident Appeals, for the Truth of their Doctrine to the Holy Scriptures. When that Veil was removed, the Scriptures translated, and the World become more intelligent and inquisitive, some other Artifice was to be found out, which might preserve the Credit of antient Errors, and defend them from the silence and opposition of Scripture. To this end no stratagem could conduce more than the constant Artifice of all Innovators in Religion, the Plea of Tradition. Before that, lesser Artifices could hide the Deformity of their Errors, and while ignorant Christians could be securely misled with false, and some-

sometimes foolish Interpretations of Scripture, while *Ecce duos gladios* was thought sufficient to evince the coercive Power of the Pope over temporal Princes; and *Arabant boves, juxta comedebant asini*, could effectually perswade the Laity intirely to resign up their Judgments to the Direction of the Clergy, there was no need of any desperate Remedy; but when persons became so far inquisitive, as to inquire into Reasons of Things, and demand some better Authority for the belief of Articles imposed on them; nothing less than the arrogant pretence of an infallible Tradition could secure and palliate the contradiction of impossible Propositions.

To prove therefore *Aquinas* his Doctrine concerning the Rule of Faith, to have been intirely agreeable to that of our Author, I will go no farther than his Sum of Divinity, the most famous and best known of all his Works. In the beginning of it laying down the Principles upon which Divinity and the proofs of Religion ought to proceed: he saith †; That *this Holy Doctrine useth the Authority of Philosophers as extraneous, and only probable; but the Authorities of Holy Scripture as properly belonging to her, and concluding necessarily (or infallibly) but the Authorities of other Doctors of the Church as properly indeed belonging to her, but concluding only probably. For our Faith is founded upon the Revelation made to the Apostles and Prophets, who wrote the Canonical Books of Scripture, and not upon any Revelation made to other Doctors; if any such there be. Whence S. Augustin saith in his*  
*Epistle*

† Sed tum S. Doctrina hujusmodi auctoritatibus (philosophorum) utitur quasi extraneis argumentis & probabilibus, auctoritatibus autem Canonica Scriptura utitur propriè ex necessitate argumentando, auctoritatibus autem aliorum doctorum ecclesie, quasi arguendo ex propriis sed probabilibus. Invenitur enim fides nostra revelationi Apostolis & Prophetis facta, qui canonicos libros scripserunt; non autem revelationi, si qua fuit aliis Doctoribus facta. unde dicit Augustinus in epistola ad Hier. &c. par. 1. qu. 1. art. 8.

## P R E F A C E.

*Epistle to S. Hierom, To the Books of Scripture only, which are called Canonical, have I learned to pay this honour, that I should most firmly believe none of their Authors to have erred in any thing in composing them. In the two next Articles it is inquired, whether Holy Scripture may use Metaphors, and contain diverse senses under one and the same Letter. In both places the Objections are thus formed. These Qualities would be incongruous to a Rule of Faith; but the Scripture is the Rule of Faith. This last Proposition is no where reinforced in the Objections, but laid down as an uncontroverted Principle. Aquinas in answering them, no where denies Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, but endeavours to take off the incongruity of a metaphorical and ambiguous Style to the Rule of Faith; and in answer to both*

*\* Non tamen ex hoc aliquid deperit S. Scripturæ; quia nihil sub spiritali sensu continetur fidei necessarium, quod Scripturæ per literalem sensum alicubi manifestè non tradat. Art. 10.*

*Objections hath these words. \* Although Metaphors and Allegories be found in Scripture, yet doth Holy Scripture suffer no detriment or imperfection thereby. For nothing necessary to Faith is contained under the*

*hidden sense, which Scripture doth not somewhere manifestly deliver in the literal sense. Afterwards being about to dispute of God, and the Mysteries of the Trinity, and Incarnation, he proposeth this as a most certain and undoubted Principle, That † we ought to affirm nothing of God, which*

*† De Deo dicere non debemus, quod in S. Scripturâ non invenitur, vel per verba, vel per sensum. qu. 36. Art. 2.*

*is not found in Holy Scripture, either in words or in sense: conformably to what the Master of Sentences, and Founder of the School Divinity had before taught; who inquiring what Method is to be observed in treating of the Trinity, answers, That*

That \* it must in the first place be demonstrated according to the Authorities of Holy Scripture, whether the Christian Faith teacheth it or not, and in what manner.

\* *Primo, secundum auctoritates San-  
ctarum Scripturarum, utrum fides ita se  
habeat, demonstrandum. Sentent. lib. 1.  
Dist. 2. qu. 3.*

But to return to *Aquinas*, he asserteth Scripture to be the Rule of Faith in many other places of his Summ. Thus disputing † of the nature and properties of the New Law or Covenant, he inquires whether it be a written Law. in resolving of this Question he opposeth not the written Law to Tradition, but to the Law written in the Hearts of Men, by the virtue and operation of the Holy Ghost; and at last concludeth thus:

|| *The New Law is principally that very Grace of the Holy Ghost which is written in the Hearts of the Faithful; but secondarily it is the written Law, in as much as those things are delivered in it which either dispose to Grace, or respect the use of that Grace.*

|| *Lex nova principaliter ipsa gratia est Spiritus S. in corde fidelium scripta; secundario autem est lex scripta, prout in ea traduntur illa, quae vel ad gratiam disponunt, vel ad usum ipsius gratiae spectant. Ibid.*

Here the very nature of this Question, and comparison of the Written with the New Law, supposeth that the whole System of revealed Truths is contained in the written Law: and lest we should doubt of this supposition, the latter part of the Passage now cited plainly determines it. But to proceed, *Aquinas* often reneweth this supposition; and at last comparing the Old with the New Testament, he determineth thus: \* *All things which are plainly and explicitly delivered to be believed in the New Testament, are delivered also to be believed in the Old Testament, but implicitly and obscurely.*

\* *Omnia quae credenda traduntur in Novo Testamento explicitè & apertè, traduntur credenda in Veteri Testamento, sed implicitè & sub figurâ, & secundùm hoc etiam quantum ad credenda lex nova continetur in veteri. Ibid. Art. 3.*

And in this respect also as to matters of Belief, the new Law is contained in the old. - But if all matters of Belief in the new Law be contained in the

Old Testament; and whatsoever is contained in the Old Testament, is plainly and explicitly taught in the New Testament: then the New Testament doth not only contain all matters of Belief in the New Law, but also, which is more considerable, proposeth them clearly and explicitly. He intimates the same no less manifestly, when he teacheth, That † *Man is bound explicitly to believe all the Articles of Faith;*

† Tenetur homo explicitè credere omnes fidei articulos, implicitè verò quæcunque in sacra traduntur Scripturâ. 2. 2. Qu. 1. Art. 5. Concl.

*but implicitly whatsoever is delivered in Holy Scripture.* Here he manifestly supposeth Scripture, not Tradition,

to be the Rule of all Articles of Faith. Otherwise he was obliged by all the Laws of Reason to conclude, that an implicit Belief, not of all things delivered by Scripture, but of all delivered by Tradition is required.

But the most considerable Testimony of *Aquinas* is yet behind. For inquiring whether the Articles of Faith be conveniently disposed in the Creed, he formeth this Objection against it. || *It should seem that the Articles of Faith are inconveniently disposed in the Creed.*

¶ Videtur quod inconvenienter articuli fidei in Symbolo ponantur. Sacra enim Scriptura est regula fidei cui nec addere nec subtrahere licet. Dicitur enim, &c. 2. 2. Qu. 1. Art. 9.

*For Holy Scripture is the Rule of Faith; to which it is unlawful either to add, or to*

*take away. For it is said Deut. IV. Ye shall not add to the word which I speak unto you, nor take away from it. Therefore it was unlawful to compose another Creed, in manner of a Rule of Faith, after the Promulgation of the Rule of Faith.* Here certainly, if ever, was a fair occasion presented to deny Scripture to be the Rule of Faith. But *Aquinas* is so far from doing it, that he allows it, and endeavours to prove, that the Composure of a Creed doth not necessarily include either any Addition to, or diminution from

\* Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod veritas fidei in S. Scripturis diffusè continetur, & variis modis, &c. Et fidei sunt ne-

Scripture. For thus he answers, \* *To this Objection it is to be answered, that the truth of Faith is diffusively contained*

in



in Holy Scriptures, and divers ways, and in some places obscurely: so that to collect the true Faith out of Scripture, a long Study and Exercise is required, to which all those cannot arrive who are necessarily obliged to believe the truth of Faith, since many of them, taken up with other business, cannot attend to study. Therefore it was necessary that somewhat manifest should summarily be collected out of the sentences of Holy Scripture, which might be proposed to all to be believed: which indeed was not added to Holy Scripture, but rather taken out of Holy Scripture.

I have used the greater diligence in representing the Doctrine of Aquinas, because he beareth not a single Testimony, but carrieth a numerous train of School Divines along with him. I proceed now to the Writers of the fifteenth Age, contemporary to our Author, premising only the Authority of a Learned and Judicious Canonist of the precedent Age. This was *Marsilius Patavinus*, Professor at Padua, and Privy Counsellor to Lewis the Emperor: who asserteth, † That we are bound to believe the Pope and Bishops to have received such a Power and Authority from Christ, as we can evince from the Words of Scripture, was conferred on them, and no other.

But he more plainly afterwards decides the Question, when he layeth down this Proposition. || To no Speech or Writing are we bound to give certain faith and credence, or acknowledge them to be true, upon pain of damnation; except to those which are called Canonical, that is, which are contained in the Volume of the Bible.

*cessarium ut ex sententiis S. Scripture aliquid manifestum summarie colligetur, quod proponeretur omnibus ad credendum: quod quidem non est additum S. Scripture, sed potius ex S. Scriptura disjunctum. Ibid.*

† Eos enim talem potestatem et auctoritatem habuisse à Christo tenemur credere; qualem per verba Scripturae sibi tradita convincere possumus, non aliam. *Defensor pacis. l. 2. c. 4.*

|| Nulli sermone vel scriptura fidem sive credulitatem certam aut confessionem veritatis præstare tenemur, nisi iis quæ Canonica appellantur, i. e. quæ in volumine Biblicæ continentur. *Ibid. l. 2. c. 28.*

In the beginning of the fifteenth Age the Council

\* *De gest. Concil. Basil. l. 1. paulò ante med.*

of *Constance* was held: which, as *Æneas Sylvius* \* as-  
sureth us, founded all their Decrees and Definitions  
upon the Authority of Holy Scripture. The most emi-  
nent Divine in that Council, and indeed of all Christen-  
dom, at that time, was *John Gerson*, Chancellor of  
*Paris*; who, by the unanimous Delegation of all the  
Bishops, drew up the Decrees of the Council; a per-  
son of that Eminence and Repute, that by reason of  
the known Conformity between his Opinions and the  
received Doctrines of the Church, he was usually styled,  
*The most Christian Doctor*; and when the *Bohemians*  
declined the Authority of the Council, Cardinal *Za-  
barella* could oppose no Argument to them more plau-  
sible than the Reputation and Fame of *Gerson*. To find  
out therefore the received Opinion of the Church in  
his time, he ought in the first place to be consulted.

Thus then he delivers his Opinion: † *Holy Scripture*

† *Scriptura sacra est regula fidei, contra quam bene intellectam non est admittenda autoritas seu ratio, &c. Hæc regula fundamentum est commune nobis & hereticis quos impugnare conamur. Tract. contra Hæresin de commun. sub utrâque specie, Opp. Tom. 1. p. 521.*

*is the Rule of Faith; against which, rightly understood, no authority or reason of any Man whatsoever is to be admitted. Neither is any Custom, Constitution or Observation valid, if it be proved to be contrary to Holy Scri-*

*pture. This Rule is a common Foundation both to us, and those Hereticks, against whom I now dispute. He was then disputing against the Bohemians, the Followers of Huss and Wickliff, whom all know to have asserted Scripture to be the Rule of Faith. In another place he hath these words. In examining Doctrines it must be first and principally inquired, whether the Doctrine be conformable to Holy Scripture as well in it self, as in its circumstances. This is manifest from the authority of S. Dionysius, who pronounceth thus: We must not dare to teach any thing of Divine Matters, except what is delivered to us in Holy Scripture. Of which the Reason is this;*

this; because Scripture was delivered to us as a sufficient and infallible Rule for the Government of the whole Body of the Church, and the members of it, even to the end of the World. Scripture therefore is an Art, a Rule, and a Copy of that Nature; that any other Doctrine not conformable to it, is either to be rejected as heretical, or suspected; or at least to be esteemed no part of Religion, nor belonging to it. Every Revelation is suspected, which the Law and the Prophets, with the Gospel, do not confirm. Otherwise they are rather to be esteemed the Delusions of Devils, or rather the Capricios of Mens Brains, than Revelations. To such Idiots that saying of Christ may justly be objected: Ye err, not knowing the Scriptures. But some will say: From the beginning of the Gospel to this day some wholesom Doctrines are found in the Mouths and Writings of Men; which the Holy Scripture doth not contain. I answer, that Scripture contains them all according to some degrees of Catholick Truths. Lastly, disputing of those Articles of Faith, which are necessary to be believed, he determines thus: \* *It is manifest, that the Canon of the Bible is the whole revealed Law of God; whose Literal Assertions are founded upon this one only literal Principle.*

At the same time *Nicolas Clemangis*, Doctor of the Sorbon, was held in great repute for his extraordinary Learning and Piety: who, treating of the Rule of Faith, and Authority of General Councils, placeth the first in Scripture, and denieth the latter to be infallible in these words: † *But although the Authority of the Church*

*Nihil audendum dicere de divinis, nisi quæ nobis à Scripturâ sacrâ tradita sunt. Cujus ratio est quoniam Scriptura nobis tradita est tanquam regula sufficiens & infallibilis pro regimîe totius Ecclesiastici corporis & membrorum usque in finem sæculi. Est igitur talis ars, talis regula vel exemplar, cui se non conformans alia doctrinæ vel abjicienda est, ut hæreticalis, aut suspecta; aut impertinens ad religionem profus est habenda. Suspecta est omnis revelatio, quam non confirmat lex & propheta cum Evangelio. Alioquin, &c. De Examinat. Doctrin. Par. 2. Tom. 1. p. 541.*

\* *Constat autem quod Canon Biblia lex est Dei per revelationem habita; cujus Assertiones literales inniuntur huic unico literali principio. Declarat. verit. quæ credenda sunt de necessit. salut. Tom. 1. p. 414.*

† *Licet autem Ecclesia militantis auctoritas sit maxima, &c. non illi tamen Militant*

Nos oportet (ut videtur) triumphantis Ecclesie titulos ascribere, ut infallibilis sit & impeccabilis, qua sepe, ut nō sibi & fallit & fallitur.—Mirum sane primā specie satis videtur, quod auctoritatem peregrinantis in terrā Ecclesie auctoritati videtur Evangelii antepone: cū in multis illa falli possit, illud omnino nequaquam possit: & cum ipsius Ecclesie auctoritas quantum ad ipsius radicem & fundamentum maxime ex Evangelio constet, &c. Disput. de materiā Cons. Gen. p. 61, 62. Lugd. Bat. 1613.

Militant be very great, which founded upon a firm Rock cannot be shaken; and against which the Gates of Hell shall never be able to prevail: yet we ought not (as it should seem) to ascribe to it the Titles of the Church Triumphant, as that it is infallible and impeccable; which, as you know, often both doth deceive, and is deceived.

—It seemeth indeed very odd, that any one should prefer the Authority of the Church Militant to the Authority of the Gospel; whereas the Church may err in many things, the Gospel cannot in the least: and the Authority of the Church it self, as to the Ground and Foundation of it is chiefly deduced from the Gospel. Nay, the very Institution, Power and Edification of the Church can no way so expressly and certainly be known, as from the Gospel. But, as I imagin, it can by no method be so certainly determined, whether the Church or the Gospel be of greater Authority, as by supposing this Case, when the Church desineth any thing contrary to the Gospel. I know indeed that this cannot be. (This is to be understood of the Belief and received Doctrine of the Universal Church, not of the Decrees of the Representative Church. Otherwise Clemangis will most foolishly contradict himself.) However, that we may the better find out the truth, let us put this Case; Do you imagin, that in that case S. Augustin would have rejected the Doctrine of the Gospel, and adhered to the Definition of the Church? No surely. Where he proceeds at large to urge this Argument, and thereby to assert the Superiority of the Scriptures Authority to that of the Church.

Before the middle of this Century flourished *Thomas Waldensis*, Provincial of the Carmelites, and Confessor

to two Kings of England, Henry V. and Henry VI. successively, generally accounted the most Learned English Man of his Age, and the great Champion of the Papal Cause against the Lollards and other supposed Hereticks of his time, against whom he writ a large and elaborate Work; which was in a particular manner confirmed and approved by a special Bull of Pope Martin V. Therein proposing an intire System of Divinity, he layeth down the Sufficiency of Scripture as a most certain Principle in three whole Chapters; † out of † *Doctrinale fidei antiqua.* which I will produce some few Passages. Disputing *Tom. 1. lib. 3. cap. 23, 21, 22.* therefore of all Articles necessary to be believed, and the complete System of Christian Faith, he useth these words; *They who || yet believe the Canon of Scripture to be imperfect, and that it may yet be augmented by the Authority of the Church, do yet with the Jews expect the fulness of time, perhaps under a Jewish Messias.* He then takes notice of that famous Passage of S. Augustin, *I would not believe the Gospel, unless the Authority of the Catholick Church perswaded me.* And giveth this Answer to it: *I do not approve the arrogance of some Writers, who upon occasion of this place maintain the Decrees of Bishops in the Church to be of greater Weight, Authority and Dignity, than is the Authority of the Scriptures. Which indeed seemeth not so foolish as mad: unless such an one would say Philip were greater than Christ; when he induced Nathanael to believe that Christ was he of whom Moses writ in the Law and the Prophets: although without his Authority (or Admonition) he would not have at that time perceived it. — All Ecclesiastical Authority, since it serveth only to bear testimony of Christ, and of his Laws, is of less Dignity than the Laws of*

*|| Qui adhuc credunt Scripturarum Canonem imperfectum, & posse adhuc augeri per auctoritatem Ecclesie, cum Judaeis plenitudinem temporis expectant, Judaico sorsum sub Messia. cap. 21.*

*Nec tamen hic laudo supercilium quod quidam attollunt, volentes occasione hujus dicti decretum patrum in Ecclesia majoris esse auctoris & culminis & ponderis, quam sit auctoritas Scripturarum. Quod quidem non tam ineptum videtur quam factum: nisi talis quis dicat, &c. cap. 21.*

*Christ.*



*Christ, and must necessarily submit to the Holy Scriptures. Well therefore did S. Thomas (Aquinas) allegorize, when he introduced the Samaritan Woman to represent the universal Church: which Woman, when the Citizens of Samaria heard preaching Christ, they were induced to believe on him, &c. This Passage clearly represents to us the Opinion of Waldensis to have been, that by the attestation of the Church, the Divine Authority of the Scripture is known: which being once known, all matters of Belief, and Articles of Faith are to be learned from the Scripture; just as Philip induced Nathanael, and the Samaritan Woman her Neighbours to believe Christ to be a Divine Person: of the truth of which, when once satisfied, they learned not the Rules of Life, or Articles of Faith from Philip, or the Woman, but received both from Christ himself. And therefore Waldensis subjoyns, That the Authority of the Scripture is far superior to the Authority of all Doctors, even of the whole Catholick Church; and that although the Catholick Church should attest and confirm their Authority; that the Authority of all latter Men (following the Apostles) and Churches ought to be submitted to the Authority of the holy Canon, even to its Footstool: That\* the*

\* Subjicitur tamen ipsi, sicut testis judici, & testimonium veritati, sicut præconizatio definitioni, & sicut præconi. *Ibid.*

*former is subjected to the latter, as a Witness to a Judge, and a testimony to the truth; as a promulgation to a Law, and as an Herald to a King. As a testimony therefore is no farther to be regarded than as it is true, a promulgation invalid, when it either increaseth or mutilates the Law; and an Herald not to be obeyed when he exceeds the Commission of the King: so the Decrees, Definitions and Doctrines of the Church are no longer to be respected, than as they are exactly conformable to the Scripture, and deduced from it. Upon this account Waldensis teacheth in the next Chapter,*

Chapter, That the Church cannot superadd any new Articles of Faith to the Scripture: and that the Faith from the times of John the Evangelist (who writ the last Book of Scripture) receiveth no increase. And therefore applieth to the Books of Canonical Scripture, the measure of the new City of God made by the Angel in the XXI. Chapter of the Revelations; That as the circuit of that City consisted of so many miles, neither more nor less; so the whole System of Christian Faith and Divine Revelations is completed and contained in so many Books of Scripture; and can receive no farther Addition. Lastly, shewing how many ways the Knowledge of the Catholick Truth may be attained, he saith, \* *It may be obtained*

*best of all, and most certainly from the Canonical Scripture.* He proceeds to prove this from the Authority of S. Augustin, and then concludes; See

*four ways of coming to the undoubted Truth, but more or less certain: of which the first and most certain is by the Holy Scriptures: the rest begetting only an Historical and uncertain knowledge of the Articles of Religion,*

However these Doctors already mentioned were of great authority, and sufficiently declare the common Doctrine of the Church in their time; yet the practice and judgment of General Councils will give us greater assurance of it. Two General Councils were held at the same time in this Age, the one at *Basil*, the other at *Florence*. In both together the whole Western Church was present by its Representatives; and in that of *Florence* the Eastern also. These two Councils indeed thundered out Excommunications one against the other; yet both agreed in using Scripture as the Rule of their Definitions, and in all Disputations laid that down as a common uncontroverted Principle. I begin with the Council of *Basil*; wherein *Johannes de Raguso*, a

\* *Omnium optime atque certissime Scripturis Canoniciis. - Ecce quatuor vias veniendi ad indubiam veritatem, sed plura et minus certae, quarum prima & certissima est per Scripturas Divinas. Ibid.*

Learned Dominican, by the appointment of the Bishops, disputed publicly in the year 1433 against the *Bohemians* about Communion under both kinds. Here magnifying the Authority of the Church, he urgeth this Argument chiefly, that without the Attestation of the Church, the Divine Authority of the Scripture cannot be known; and consequently, that the Authority of the Church is antecedent to the knowledge even of the Rule of Faith, and therefore the first Principle of the Christian Religion. For thus he argues: † *But that*

† Quod autem prædictus articulus sit inter alios omnes primus, in quem omnes alii resolvuntur, manifestum est: quia si dubitatio circa alios articulos contingit, statim ad sacram Scripturam veluti ad certissimam & inobliquabilem regulam communiter recurritur; & secundum testimonium veritatis ejusdem sublati dubiis veritas elucescit. — Nisi autem Ecclesie existentia sciatur, nulla est Scripturæ autoritas. Concil. Tom. XII. p. 1025.

*the aforesaid Article ( the existence of one holy Catholick Church ) is the first of all others, into which all others are resolved, is manifest. For if any doubt arise concerning any other Articles, recourse is immediately made by common consent to the Holy Scripture, as to a most certain and invariable Rule; and according to the Testimony of Scripture the Truth is cleared, and all Doubts removed.*—

*For unless the Existence of the Church be known, Scripture hath no Authority.* Whether this Argument be valid and conclusive, concerns not my present purpose. It is sufficient, that he assumes this Proposition, *Scripture is the Rule of Faith*; as an undoubted Principle common to both Parties. However, if by a Church in this place he meant no more than a Society of credible Persons, whose unanimous attestation of a matter of Fact ought to be received, the Argument will be good and valid. And that he meant no more, I am induced to believe; because, immediately after, disputing of the Authority of a Church properly so called, he acknowledgeth the proof of this Article is to be taken from Holy Scripture, However, these words cannot infer the Doctrine at this day received in the Church of Rome; since they expressly assert the Scripture to be the Rule and Judge of all

*Præcipue & maxime sumenda est ex auctoritate S. Scripture. p. 1025.*

all Articles of Faith, saving this one of the Existence of the Church; and attribute to the Church no more than the power of bringing us to the knowledge of the Scripture, which thenceforward is to be used as our only Rule and Guide. He proceeds to lay down several Suppositions, as Foundations and Postulates of his subsequent Determinations. Of these the sixth is conceived in these words: || *Faith and all things necessary to Salvation, as well Masters of Belief, as of Practise, are founded in the literal sense (of Holy Scripture) and from thence only may Arguments be drawn to prove those things which are of Faith, and of necessity to Salvation.* The seventh Supposition is this: † *Holy Scripture in the literal sense well and soundly understood, is the infallible and most sufficient Rule of Faith.* This he doth not only suppose, but also proveth with divers Arguments; of which the second is this: \* *If Holy Scripture were not a sufficient Rule of Faith, it would follow, that the Holy Ghost, who is the Author of it, had insufficiently delivered it; which is by no means to be thought of God, all whose works are perfect. Besides if Holy Scripture were deficient in some things necessary to Salvation; then those things, which are wanting, might lawfully and meritoriously be superadded from some other Principle: or if any things were superfluous in it, they might lawfully be diminished. But this is forbidden by S. John the Evangelist in the last of the Revelations; where he saith, If any one add to this Book, &c. From which words of John the Evangelist it is clearly proved, that nothing is deficient or superfluous in Holy Scripture: which is also consentaneous to the Author of it, who is the Holy Ghost, as was before said, to whose Omnipotence it agreeth, that he give us a System of Wisdom neither deficient,*

|| Sexta Suppositio. Fides & omnia necessaria ad salutem tam credenda quam agenda fundantur in sensu literalis (S. Scripturae) & ex ipso solo argumentatio sumitur ad probandum ea quae fidei sunt vel necessitatis ad salutem. p. 1028.

† Septima suppositio. S. Scriptura in sensu literalis sancte & bene intellecta est infallibilis fidei regula & sufficientissima.

\* Si S. Scriptura non esset sufficiens fidei regula, sequeretur quodd, &c. p. 1029.

PREFACE.

not superfluous; and that he should deliver it in a method agreeable to our necessity of Salvation.

In the Council of *Florence* however the Greeks and Latins differed in all other things, till the former were forced into a compliance by the Commands and Threats of their Emperor; yet in this they agreed, in laying down Scripture to be the only Rule and Principle of Faith, although they dissented in determining how far it might be explained by the Church. The Controversie was occasioned by the addition of *FILIOQUE* to the *Nicene* Creed; this the Greeks maintained to be unlawful, because the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son is not in express Terms taught in Scripture; which they held to be the only Rule of Faith. The Latins denied not this, but only asserted, that it was sufficient this procession was taught in the Scripture in implicit Terms; the Church having authority by explanation of those obscure Passages, to constitute Articles necessary to be believed, and add them to the Creed, although but implicitly contained in Holy Scripture, the Rule of Faith; and consequently, that to insert *FILIOQUE* in the Creed, was no addition to the Faith, since that Article is implicitly contained in Holy Scripture. The Opinion of the Greeks is thus represented by *Bessarion*, Archbishop of *Nice*, who was chosen by the Greeks to

† Πάντα γὰρ τὰ θεῶν δόγματα ἀπὸ πα-  
λαιῶν ἑσίων γραφῶν ἀρνούμεθα, αὐτοὶ  
εἰσὶν ἀρχαὶ καὶ θεμέλια τῆς πίστεως,  
ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐδῶ αὐτοὺς ἀπορρίπτου, ἐφ'  
ὅτι συζητεῖν, ὅτι παρ' ἐμῶν, ὅς ἐστι  
ὁ μὲν ἡμεῖς, οὗ παρ' ὑμῶν Χριστιανὸν  
Concil. Flor. Sess. 8. Conc. Tom. XII. p. 148.

manage and defend their Cause. † We derive and receive all Articles of Faith from the Fountains of Holy Scriptures, which are the Principles and Foundations of our Faith. Nothing was ever added to them (accounted necessary

to be believed, which is not contained in them) *nor may any thing ever be added to them, neither by us, while we are our selves, nor by any other Christians.* And when the Latins recurred to their wonted refuge of Explanation or Declaration made by the Church, of what is implicitly contained in Scripture, *Bessarion* replied,

\* That



\* That it is undeniable, that although anything were added by way of Declaration, it was still an addition, which seemeth to be forbidden; and consequently the addition of this word (*FILIOQUE*), is forbidden. But whereas ye alledge the Actions of the Fathers (in Councils) wherein some things seem to be thus explained, this reacheth not our Question. For that any thing should be added to the Faith, it never was, nor ever will be lawful.

The Bishop of Friuli was chosen by the Latins to answer the Arguments of Bessarion, and defend the addition of the word *FILIOQUE*. This he doth not by denying Scripture to be the Rule of Faith, but endeavouring to prove, that the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son might be deduced from the Principles of Faith, viz. from the Holy Scriptures. *Te grant*, saith he, that Articles of Faith are taken from the fountain of Scriptures, which are the Principles of Faith. From this Proposition we infer, that a Declaration, Expression and Explication, which is made concerning an Article of Faith, or of the Creed, by the Writings of the Gospel, the Epistles of Paul, and the Books of the Old and New Testament, is by no means to be accounted extraneous, or a Doctrine of another kind, since it is the Doctrine of God and of the Church. For then only is a proof to be accounted extraneous, when it is made not by the proper Principles of that Doctrine, but by the Principles of some other kind of Science. As if a Physical Conclusion should be proved by a Mathematical Principle. But according to you the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the Principles

\* Negari non potest, ut si per modum declarationis veniret, quis sit additio, qua prohibita videtur, & prohibitum hoc verbum apponi. Cum vero induxistis acta Patrum, quibus aliqua videntur declarari, dubium nostrum non tangit. Nam quod aliquod apponatur fidei, hoc nunquam licuit, neque licet. Concil. Flor. par. 2. Collat. 7. Concil. Tom. XIII. p. 935.

|| Dicitur sic, dogmata fidei sumuntur ex fonte Scripturarum, quæ sunt principia fidei. Ex hoc dicto inferimus nos, quod declaratio, expressio & explicatio, quæ fit circa articulum fidei vel symboli, per Scripturas Evangelii, epistolas Pauli, & VII. & Nov. Testamenti, nullo modo est extrinseca reputanda, aut alterius generis doctrina; cum sit doctrina Dei & Ecclesiæ. Quia tunc tantum dicitur probatio extrinseca, quando fit non per principia illius doctrinæ, sed, &c. Ergo probatio & declaratio quæ fit per huiusmodi Scripturas, fit notorie per principia propria fidei, & intrinseca doctrinæ nostræ. Ibid. Collat. 10. p. 959.

Item nec proprie additio dici debet, illo dato, sc. quod ex propriis principii fidei, sc. ex S. Scripturis evidenter deducatur. Ibid. p. 960.

## P R E F A C E.

of Faith. Therefore a Proof and Declaration, which is made by these Scriptures, is plainly made by the proper Principles of Faith, and intrinsecal Principles of our Religion.—Iea, this ought not properly to be called an addition, this being once granted, viz. That it may be evidently deduced from the proper Principles of Faith, that is, from the Holy Scriptures. This manner of Disputation in defending the Article then in question, sufficiently manifests, that the pretence of Oral Tradition, however entertained by some private Men, had yet gained no general applause in the Western Church.

From Councils I return to private Writers, but those of so great Repute and Authority, that their Opinion can be esteemed no other than the general Doctrine of the Church at that time. Of these I shall produce only two more, Cardinal *Panormitan*, and *Antoninus*, Archbishop of *Florence*; the first, accounted by all, the greatest Canonist of his Age, and by many the greatest of all Ages: and which is more considerable, who had been to the Council of *Basil*, what *Gerson* was to that of *Constance*, an Oracle and Dictator: the second a person of so great Authority in the Church, that in the Judgment of Pope *Nicolas* he deserved to be Sainted whilst alive, and was really Sainted, when dead. *Panormitan* therefore proposeth his Opinion in these words: † *In Matters per-*

† *In concernentibus fidem concilium est supra Papam.—Puto tamen quod si Papa moveretur melioribus rationibus, &c. Nam & Concilium potest errare, sicut alius erravit. Nam in concernentibus fidem etiam dictum unius privati esset preferendum dicto Papa, si ille moveretur melioribus rationibus N. & V. Testamenti quam Papa. In cap. Significasti de electione.*

*taining to Faith, a Council is above the Pope.—Yet I suppose, that if the Pope were induced with better Reasons and Authorities than the Council, that his Determination were rather to be embraced. For a Council also can err, as it hath sometimes erred. For in matters relating to Faith, even the opinion of one private Man were to be preferred to the Determination of the Pope, if he were induced with better Reasons of the Old and New Testament than the Pope. Here Panormitan not only asserteth the Old and New Testament to be*  
the

the Rule of Faith, but also allows to every private Man a power of interpreting that Rule, and even of rejecting the Definitions of Popes and Councils, if he thinks them not consonant to it. *Antoninus* hath transcribed those words into his Summ of Divinity, \* and \* *Par. 3. tit. 23. cap. 2. Sect. 6.* proposeth them as his own Opinion. And not only so, but also in another place declareth his Judgment no less plainly in these words; † *God speaketh in the Scriptures, and so fully (as S. Gregory explaineth in the twenty second Book of his Morals upon Job) that it is not necessary God should any other way reveal any thing necessary to us, since all things necessary may be had there.*

† *Loquitur Deus in Scripturis, & ita copiose (ut Gregorius exponit 22. Moral.) quod non oportet Deum iterum loqui nobis aliquid necessarium, cum ibi omnia habentur. Par. 3. lib. 18. cap. 3.*

After so many and so great Authorities, it cannot reasonably be doubted, what was the general Belief of the Church in that Age touching the Rule of Faith: I mean not, that then the Sufficiency of the Scripture was asserted by all, and denied by none; but only that it was maintained by the greater, and more considerable part of the Church; as the Practice of General Councils, and Positions of the most famous Writers of that Age do manifestly evince. Many indeed had for some Ages before asserted the existence of some necessary Articles not contained in Scripture, but conveyed down to us by Tradition only; but they equalled not the Followers of the former Opinion, either in number or Reputation. And therefore *Occam* || in the preceding Age, representing the Arguments and Reasons of both Opinions, proposeth that of the Sufficiency of Scripture in the first place, as the most common, and more generally received Opinion: and *Joannes de Neapoli*, \* a Domini \* *Vide Quæst. 21. puncti. 2. question. 3. Edit. Neap. 1618.* can, and Doctor of the *Sorbon*, disputing of the Science of Faith, doth all along suppose, that whole Science to be contained in Scripture; and lest we should doubt of his Opinion, doth in more than one place positively assert it. Not to say, that *Nicolas de Lyra*, in his

† *Vide Edit.*  
*Lugd. 1518.*

his Glosses upon the whole Bible, doth every where suppose it; and in his general Preface † most expressly maintain it. And of what Repute his Gloss was formerly in the Church of *Rome*, may appear from that vast number of Manuscript Copies of them, which may be found in our ancient Libraries. But I will not any longer insist upon the Writers of this Age, having intended to confine my Discourse to the fifteenth Age; the general Belief of which, concerning the Rule of Faith, I have already manifested,

It remains, that I say somewhat more particular of the Treatise here published, and of the Author of it. He was born in *Wales*, and bred in *Oriel* College in *Oxford*; where he was created Doctor of Divinity, and obtained a great esteem for his rare Eloquence, and extraordinary Learning. He was soon taken notice of by that great Patron and Protector of Learning and Virtue, *Humphrey*, Duke of *Glocester*, at that time Protector of the Kingdom; by whose Favour he was promoted to the Bishoprick of *S. Asaph*, in the year 1444; translated to *Chichester* in the year 1450.

His singular Learning appears not only from this Discourse, which, if put into modern English, would appear to the meanest Reader both rational and elegant: but also from many other plain and manifest Indications. He had read the Works of the Fathers with no small care and diligence; and as it should seem from what he says upon the Article of Christ's Descent into Hell, had made Critical Observations on them, far beyond the Genius and vulgar Learning of that Age. He was not unacquainted with the Genuine Epistles of *Ignatius*; and in the first Part of that Work, whereof this Treatise makes the second, citeth the Acts of his Martyrdom, writ by his contemporary *Philo*, and published in this Age by the Learned Bishop *Usher*. As his Learning enabled him, so his Zeal prompted him to write divers Books of Controversie in defence of the Church against the sup-  
posed

posed Hereticks of that time, the Lollards: whom he endeavoured by all means possible to reduce into the Communion of his Church: to which Work, as it should seem from divers Passages in the first part, he had dedicated his whole Life. He mentions many of them in this Work, which are these: *The just apprising of holi Scripture. The just apprising of Doctours. Of faith in Latyn. Of Presthode. The Donet. The folower to the Donet. The Represser. The forrier. The booke of Cristen Religion. The provoker. The booke of signis in the Church clepid also the boke of Worschipping. The boke of Leernyng. The boke of filling the IV. Tablis. This present booke of feith. Of the Church in Latyn.* Beside these already mentioned, *Bale*

\* reckons up, *The Defender. The Follower of it. The Declaratory. Of the Creed. To Godharde the Franciscan. Of Divine Offices. A Manual. Of the Providence of God. Of the Liberty of the Gospel. Of the Power of Seculars. Against Constantines Donation. Of the equality of Ministers. Of the Laws and Doctrines of Men. Of Communion under both kinds. Against unlawful Begging. An Account of his own Recantation.* The greatest part of these Books are lost, being studiously suppressed by his Enemies, and also burnt at his Recantation. However I have seen his Represser in a fair Manuscript, in the publick Library of the University of Cambridge in *Quarto*. It is intituled, *The Repressour of over much blaming the Clergy*: wherein he passeth through all points in Controversie between the Church of Rome and the Lollards; and largely endeavours to confute the latter.

\* *De Script. Angl. Cent. 8. p. 594.*

But as his zeal induced him to plead the Cause of the Church so copiously, so his Learning enabled him to discover the Follies and gross Superstitions practised in that Age: which, when once discovered, his Piety enforced him to detest. Religion had now passed through so many ignorant and barbarous Ages; the means of greater knowledge had been so studiously hidden from the People, and the ignorance of the Laity was so ad-



vantageous to the interest of the Clergy, that the true Spirit of Christianity seemed to be wholly lost, and had degenerated into Shews and Ceremonies, many of which were unlawful, but almost all unuseful. And not only this fatal stupidity and idle Superstition had generally possessed the minds of Men; but all Remedies were detested, and all Artifices made use of to continue the Disease. Many good and Learned Men endeavoured the Reformation of these Abuses, without departing from the Communion of the Church; but were attended herein with the usual Fate of the Opposers of inveterate Evils, who seldom escape the Persecution, but never the hatred of those, who are engaged both by zeal and interest in the continuance of those Evils. Our Learned Bishop was of the number of those brave and generous persons; who while he earnestly invited the Lollards into the Communion of his Church, no less vehemently opposed the Superstitions of his own Party. Some Footsteps and Marks of this Disposition may be found in this Treatise; which prove his Integrity to have been equal to his Zeal, and neither inferior to his Learning.

The Authority of the Church, and Infallibility of her Definitions, had of late been set up as the most successful Engine against the prevailing growth of supposed Hereticks. To refute the Arguments of *Wicleff*, and convince his Followers with solid Reasons, neither the Ignorance of the Clergy, nor the Badness of their Cause did then permit. It was accounted too great a Condescension in the Governors of the Church to confute the Mistakes, and inform the Judgments of their seduced People. Yet somewhat, at least; was necessary to dazzle the eyes of the unthinking multitude, and at once convict all their Adversaries of the Charge of Heresie. Nothing could be more effectual to this end than the pretence of Infallibility; which alone might satisfie the Scruples, and command the assent of credulous persons. For this reason ever  
since

since Heresie began to be punished with death, it was thought sufficient to oppose the Infallibility of the Church to the Arguments and Reasons of condemned Hereticks; and the maintenance of this pretence was esteemed the great Bulwark of the Church. However, our Bishop easily discovered the vanity of these pretences; and in this followed the Opinion of the most Learned Writers of his Age, that the Representative Church, or General Councils, were not only fallible, but had sometimes actually erred; that the Decrees and Definitions of the Church ought to be submitted to the Examination of every private person; that no Article of Faith was to be received, which was repugnant to the Principles of Reason; and that not the Belief and Acceptation of the Church caused any Doctrine to be accounted true, and an Article of Faith, but the presupposed Truth of the Doctrine rendered the Belief of it rational and justifiable.

Indeed the Doctrine of the Churches Infallibility had by some Men in this Age been advanced so far, that nothing less than a fatal credulity, or no less fatal ignorance could excuse the admission of it. Our Author assureth us in the first part of this Book of Faith, that many Divines in his time argued from those words of S. Paul: *If we or an Angel from Heaven should teach any other Doctrine than that which ye have received, let him be anathema*, that it should happen that the Church militant and the Church triumphant disagreed in an Article of Faith, the Determination of the Church militant were rather to be followed. Such crude Positions might raise the admiration of fools, but deserved the indignation of wiser Men. Our Author chose to do justice unto Truth in owning and asserting the Fallibility of Church and Councils; and yet not to quit the specious pretence of the Churches authority in pleading her Cause, and confuting the Lollards. This therefore he proposed in a more plausible way, confessed the Church might err, and that even in matters of the greatest moment: however, that it would be most safe and rational for ignorant Laymen intirely to submit their judgment to the Direction of the Clergy; that by this submission indeed they might possibly be led into Error and mortal

Heresie; but that this would be no disadvantage to them, since in that case God would reward their submission and docility, although to them the occasion of most grievous Errors, no less than if they believed the Christian Faith intire and incorrupted; and would even bestow upon them the Crown of Martyrdom, if they laid down their lives in testimony of their Errors. And since in that Age the Laity were generally very ignorant of the true Principles of Religion, and devoid of all sort of Learning; he included them all in the number of those, whose duty and interest it was to pay an implicit submission to the direction of the Clergy.

But not only did he disown the Infallibility of the Church, but also disallowed and condemned her practice of burning Hereticks. He desired rather to win them to her obedience by gentle methods, and thought it more noble to convince them by Reasons and Arguments, than by Racks and Fires. This moderation could not but displease his Fellow Bishops, who chose rather at that time to satisfy their Malice by the punishment, than serve the Church by the conviction of supposed Hereticks. But our Author was acted with more noble and generous Principles; he endeavoured to remove their Errors, but refused to practise upon their Lives; and which perhaps was no small part of his Crime, neglected to thunder out his Curses against them, and scorned to treat them with opprobrious Titles. Rather in the first part of this Work he giveth to them an honourable Character, and confesseth them to have been generally persons of good Lives and exemplary Conversations.

The incredible Fables of Legends, and incurable itch of Lying for the Honor of their Saints and Patrons, which then reigned among all the Monastick Orders, and was fondly received by the credulous multitude, were one of the greatest scandals and most pernicious abuses in the Church at that time. The greater and more necessary Articles of Faith, and all genuine and rational knowledge of Religion had generally given place to fabulous Legends, and Romantick Stories; Fables which in this respect only differed from those of the ancient Heathen Poets, that they were  
more

more incredible, and less elegant. These, our Learned Bishop feared not to oppose and disesteem; arraigns them of Error, Heresie and Superstition; proclaims their falseness, and derides their folly.

This denial of Infallibility, moderation towards the Lollards, and disesteem of Legends, drew upon him the envy and hatred of the Clergy, to which may be added, his favour with, and faithful adherence to his Patron Duke *Humphrey*; who had always manifested a moderation towards the dissenting Lollards, and aversion from the superstitious practices of the Clergy. No sooner was the Duke oppressed by a contrary State Faction, but his Client the Bishop was attempted, and his ruin designed. Several Passages were taken out of his Writings, which his Enemies accused of Heresie, at least, of Error. Hereupon in the year 1457. he was cited to appear at a Synod held at *Lambeth*, by *Thomas Bourchier*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, attended with the Bishops of *Winchester*, *Lincoln* and *Rochester*, and 24 Divines; by whom, after a short hearing, he was condemned of Heresie, and enjoined to recant his heretical and erroneous Opinions publickly at *S. Paul's Cross*. The Recantation he performed on the fourth day of *December*, when his Books were also publickly burnt. His Fortunes after that time are very uncertain. Some relate him to have been made away in prison; others, to have been kept prisoner in his own Episcopal Palace until his natural death; and lastly, some, that he had a small pension assigned to him out of the Revenues of the Bishoprick, and retired into a Monastery, where he ended his days in a short time.

The Opinions which he was forced to recant, as they are represented by *Bale*\*, Bishop *Godwin*†, and *Fox*||, are these, \* *Cent. 8. p. 594.*  
 I. That it is the Office of a Christian Bishop, before all other things to preach the Word of God. II. That human Reason † *De presul. Ang. p. 559.*  
 is not to be preferred to the Holy Scripture. III. That the modern use of the Sacraments (as attended with so many superstitious Ceremonies and Customs) was less advantageous than the use of the Law of Nature. IV. That Bishops buying their Admissions of the Bishop of *Rome*, do sin. || *Martyrol. vol. 1. p. 928.*  
 V. That

V. That no man is bound to believe and obey the Determination of the Church of *Rome*. VI. That the Revenues of Bishops are by Inheritance the Goods of the Poor. VII. That the Apostles composed not the vulgar Creed. VIII. That the Article of Christ's Descent into Hell was not formerly in the Creed. IX. That no other sense is to be attributed to Holy Scripture, but the first and genuine sense. X. That it is not necessary to Salvation, to believe the Body of Christ is materially in the Sacrament. XI. That the Universal Church (in a General Council) may err even in Matters of Faith. XII. That it is not necessary to believe in the Holy Catholick Church. XIII. That it is not necessary to believe the Communion of Saints. XIV. That the voluntary begging of the Mendicant Friars was unprofitable, and no ways meritorious.

It must not be imagined, that these Articles were generally at that time accounted erroneous and heretical in the Church. For if we examine them, we shall find that many of them were taught and believed by the greatest Divines of the Church at that time: some at this day allowed to be literally true by the Learned Writers of the Church of *Rome*: and in fine, that our Author knew the Doctrine of the Church far better than his Judges; and although condemned by them, was no less Orthodox than they. As for the twelfth and thirteenth Articles, which seem to be most odious, they are meer Calumnies, as appears from this very Treatise, For towards the end of it he acknowledgeth it to be necessary to believe the existence of the Holy Catholick Church, and of the Communion of Saints; but yet unnecessary to believe on them, that is, as himself explains it, to give a blind assent to all their Determinations. The seventh and eighth Articles are known to be literally true by all Learned Men. For no proof can be brought, that the Apostles composed this Form of Creed, which we now use: and it is most certain, that the Article of Christ's Descent into Hell was found in none of the Ancient Creeds, for the first 400. years, except in that of the Church of *Aquileia*. The first, second, sixth and ninth Articles, if candidly interpreted, cannot be denied to be



be true by any sober Romanist; and whosoever considers the gross Ignorance and Superstition of those times, will not deny the third. The fourth Article may be justified by the Opinion of many great Canonists, who define all such payments to be Symony; and the Church of France hath all along decried and disapproved them. The fourteenth was defended by *Richard*, Archbishop of *Armagh*, *Gulielmus de S. Amore*, and many other great Divines of the Church of *Rome*. The eleventh, and consequently, the fifth Articles were believed and maintained by *Occam* \*, *Peter de Alliaco*, Cardinal of *Cambray* †, *Thomas Waldensis* ‖, *Panormitan* \*, *Antoninus* †, Cardinal *Cusanus* ‖, *Clemangis* \*, and many others in this Age. Lastly, the tenth Article may be defended from *Peter Lombard* \*, *Peter de Alliaco* †, *Scotus* ‖, *Tonstal*, Bishop of *Durham* \*, and others; who believed indeed the Truth of the Article, but denied it to be necessary to be believed.

\* *Dial. par. 1.*  
 l. 5. c. 25.  
 † *Quest. Vesper.*  
 Art. 3.  
 ‖ *Rom. 1. l. 2.*  
 c. 19.  
 \* *Loc. supra cit.*  
 † *Concord. Catb.*  
 l. 2. c. 3, 4.  
 ‖ *Disp. de Conc.*  
 \* *Sentent. l. 4.*  
 dist. 11.  
 † *Is 4. Sentent.*  
 qu. 6. Art. 4.  
 ‖ *In 4. Sentent.*  
 Dist. 11. qu. 3.  
 \* *De Eucharist.*  
 lib. 1.

That Treatise which I here publish, and which gave occasion to the present Discourse, was by me transcribed out of a Manuscript extant in *Trinity College* in *Cambridge*; which seemeth to have been written with Bishop *Peacock's* own hand, as may be conjectured from the frequent Emendations and Additions inserted in the Margin, and bottom of the Pages by the same hand. The whole Work was intituled by the Author, *A Treatise of Faith*; however, in the Front of it this Title is affixed by a later hand, *Reginald Peacock, Bishop of Chichester's Sermons; in English*: whereas the whole Treatise is a Dialogue between the Father and the Son, divided into two Books: whereof the first proposeth to treat of the most probable means of reducing the Lollards to the Church, which he assigns to be an intire submission of Judgment to the Decrees of the Church, although supposed fallible. The second treateth of the Rule of Faith. The first Part is chiefly taken up with a long Digression, proving that Faith is only probable, not sciential, or that the Truth of the Christian Religion cannot be proved by demonstrative, but only by probable Arguments. This Dispute is managed in a Scholastick Way, full of Subtleties and Niceties of Philosophy and School Divinity, and very obscure: which there-  
 fore

fore I thought not worthy either my transcribing, or the Readers perusal. However, I transcribed some considerable Fragments or *Excerpta*, which seemed to me more remarkable and worthy of notice; which I here present to the Reader. The second Book or Treatise of the Rule of Faith, I have published intire, as far as the Manuscript Copy permitted me. For, which is much to be lamented, some few Leaves were wanting in the end.

Besides what I have already mentioned, many things may be here found worthy a particular Observation; as with how great ardor he impugns the refusal of submitting the Decrees and Doctrine of the Church to the examination of every private man; how strongly he contends, that God can reveal nothing contrary to our reason, or oblige us to the belief of it: that he rejecteth the authority of *Tobit* and *Susanna*, as being Apocryphal Books; that a Divorce and Separation of the Clergy from their Wives, after Marriage once contracted, is unlawful; that the Council of *Nice* condemned that Separation, and consequently prohibited not to the Clergy the use of Marriage in the third Canon; that the Church hath no more authority of interpreting Scripture, and proposing it to the faithful, than hath every private Householder of proposing it to his Family, every Divine to his Hearers, every Learned Man to ignorant persons; or no more than a Judge hath of expounding the Laws, or a Grammarian the Rules of Grammar.

I will not so far presume upon the Judgment of the Reader, as to make an Apology for the old and obsolete stile of our Author. If it wanteth the Elegance and Beauties of our modern Language, that must be imputed to the fault of the Age, not any deficiency of the Author. I had once intended to represent his Arguments in our modern Language, and publish both together in distinct Columns, but the fear of enlarging these Papers too much, deterred me from pursuing that design. However, I have drawn up an Alphabetical Catalogue of the more obsolete and unusual words, and affixed their significations to them: which the Reader will find at the end of the Book, and may consult upon occasion.

A Treatise of REGINALD PEACOCK, Bishop  
of CHICHESTER, before the Reformation;  
(In the Year 1450.) proving that Scripture is the  
only Rule of Faith.

## C A P. I.

I. **D**esiring for to wyne the Lay Childzen of the  
Churche into Obedience, whiche undir greet  
perel of ther Soulis thei owen paie and holde  
to the Clergie, y entende and propose in this  
present Booke for to mete agens suche uno-  
bediencers bi an open wey and in a nother  
manner, and bi mane which the lay personys wole admitte  
and graunte: which mane is this: That we owen to bi-  
lave and stonde to sum Saier or Tether which map seile,  
while it is not knowne that thilk Saier or Tether therepne  
faillis. And so for to move and convicte them into obedience  
never the lesse and never the latter to the Clergie in leernyng  
their feith; thoug it were so that the Clergie mygte so-  
lempnely determyne agens trew feith.

II. Twey thingis be the pyncepal causis of Heresie in the  
lay peple. Overmpeche lernyng to Scripture, and in such  
manner wise as it losgith not to holi Scripture for to re-  
ceyve. And the seconde is this: Setting not bi for to followe  
the Determynationis and the Holdingis of the Churche in  
mater of feith.

III. The Fende hath broughte in so gret a sleight in the  
Seate of the Sarrazenes, that thei ben ful wondirful vio-  
lenti settid for to geve audience to eny prooffe making for  
Christen feith, or making agens Sarrazen Seate. For  
whi thilk wickid Man Mahumer, whiche brought in their  
Seate, or sum Prelate after him, made as for a point of his  
Law; that no persone of his Seate schulde here eny Declara-  
rioun or evydence agens his Sect, and that under payne of  
passing cruel deay. But O thou Lord Jesu God and Man,  
hed of thi Christen Churche, and Tether of Christen Bilave,

p beseeche thi mercy, thi pite and thi charite, ser be this seid  
 perel fro the Christen Churche, and fro ech person therepne  
 contempned, and schilde thou that this Denom be never  
 broughte into thi Churche, and if thou suffre it to by eny  
 while broughte in, p beseeche that it be soon agen out spet:  
 but suffre thou ordeyne and do that the Law and the feith  
 whiche thi Churche at eny tyme kepith be receyved and ad-  
 mitted to fall under this examinacioun, whether it be the  
 same verri feith, which thou and thi Apostlis taugten o: no:  
 and that it be receyved into examinacioun whether it hath  
 sufficient ebydencis for it to be verri feith o: no: and ellis it  
 mygte be holde aghe, and it were a full suspect thing to alle  
 them that schulde be convertid therto, and ellis also it were  
 a ful schameful thing to the Christen Church for to holde  
 such a feith for a substance of her salvacioun, and pitt dur-  
 sten not suffre it to be examined whether it is worthi to be  
 allowid for trew feith or no. And it were a vilonpe putting to  
 Crist, that he schulde geve such a feith to his peple, and into  
 which feith he wolde his peple turne alle other peple, and  
 pitt he wolde not allowe his feith to be at the ful tried, and  
 that he durste not be aknowe his feith to be so pure and so  
 tyne fro al falsehede, that it mygte not by strenghe of eny eby-  
 dence be overcomen. And therfore Lord Almygti, thou for-  
 bid that eny such prisonyng of thi feith be maad in thi  
 Churche. And also this is worschip pnow for Cristen feith,  
 that it may withoute fere be abowed, and be publisht and  
 be profred to be examyned bi eny wit under penene in such  
 maner of examynacioun now bifoze seid, as bi which ech  
 ppetense feith ougte to be examyned whether it be trew feith  
 o: no. And pitt serthemore to this now seid, may ebydence  
 be this: that ellis Crist wolde have gove such a Lawe to be  
 hadde and to be contynued in his name, of whiche Lawe sum  
 of our feith is a part, ne were that it mygte abowe the  
 fier of triel and of examynacioun of ech creaturis resoun, so  
 the examynacioun be such as ougte to be taken and used for  
 to examine and probe whether a feith ppetense be trewe feith  
 o: no, as serforth as eny Goldsmyth wole abowe and wa-  
 rante his Gold, which he despyeth to be tried and examyned  
 by all manner of fier of this wordli brennyng.

IV. And serthemore p wole Clerkis to have in considera-  
 cioun that not for a thing is famed to be an Article of  
 feith,



feith, therefore it is an Article of feith: but agaynward  
foz that it is an Article of feith. and proved sufficiently to  
be such, therefore it is to be bilaved bi feith. So that an  
Article to be bilaved bi feith is dependant on this, that it  
is bifoze proved sufficiently to be feith. And an Article to  
be an Article of feith is not dependent of this, foz that it is  
bilaved as an Article of feith.

V. The Clergy shall be condemned at the last day, if by  
clar witt they shalve not shen into consent of trew feith,  
otherwise than by fier and sword or hangeiment. Although  
I will not deny these second means to be lawfull, provided  
the former be first used.

VI. Thomas had thanne these same evidences ( of Christis  
Resurrection ) in as good maner as in better than we hau  
now foz us. Foz whi he herde the Apostlis denounce  
Christis Resurrection to him bi ther owne mouth, the  
that denouncen the same to us bi their Writting; and also  
he knowe by experience the treuthe and the sabnesse and the  
unbigilefulnesse of hise felowis, where that we knowen it by  
liklihode, only thoug so likeli, that to the contrary we have  
now evdence so likeli.

VII. Some y seid bifoze that there ben two maners of feith:  
won is opynial feith; and this is the which we and alle Cri-  
sten hau bi the comon lawe of God, whilis we lyven in this  
lfe. Another feith is sciencial feith; and thoug this feith  
may be had bi specialte in this lfe, pitt it is not commonli  
had in this lfe, but it is had in the Blisse of Hevene.

VIII. Wherefoze he ( the Church ) knowith not himself,  
neither ougte know himself foz to teche authentikli or bi au-  
thozite of maistrie to any person, ni lasse than he knowe him-  
self to have receyved the same feith fro God in maner of ar-  
guyng bifoze seid by won of these shenes, of which won is this:  
Holi Scripture witnessith and denouncith this Conclusion.  
Another is this Holi Church; foz feith hath bilaved this in  
tyme of the Apostlis fro thens contynueli hiderto. Another  
is this: Spracke is don unto witnessith of it.

IX. Redoun which is a syllogisme well reulid astir the cras  
taugt in Logik, and having two Prempsis openli trefwe  
and to be grauntid, is so strong and so mygti in al the kindis  
of maters, that thoug alle the Angels in Hevene wolden  
seie that this Conclusion were not trefwe: pitt we schulde



laue the Aungels seing, and we schulden truste moze to the  
profe of thilk sillogisme than to the contrari seipng of alle the  
Aungels in Hevene. For that alle Goddis creaturis musten  
nedis obeie to doome of resoun, and such a sillogisme is not  
ellis than doome of resoun. If the Church in erthe deter-  
mines agens it what such a sillogisme concludith, we schulen  
rather trowe and holde us to thilk sillogism than to the deter-  
minacion of the Church in erthe.

X. Every Man is bound to obey the determination of the  
Church; but if he can evidentli and openli without eny dowte  
schewe teche and declare that the Churche bilaveth, or hath de-  
termyned thilk Article wrongli and untreuli, or ellis that  
the Churche hath no sufficient ground for to so bilave or de-  
termyne, yhe thoug the Churche schuld bilave or determyne  
amys, yet thereof schulde not this persoun be blamed of God,  
but schuld be ful excused.

XI. Sithen it is here bifoze undoutabili proved that bi  
thi obedience to the Clergie in case of the Clergies erring,  
whilis thou it not knowist neither desirist neither makist;  
noon hurte schal come, but the same god which schuld to the  
therebi come, if the Clergie in the teaching not errid: is  
not this puous to the? what maist thou loke after eny moze?

XII. If a Parish Priest should teach his Parishioner some  
grosse Heresy instead of an Article of Feith, it were his Dutp  
to receiue, and would not only be excusable befoze God, but  
would be as meritorious, and equally rewarded with the be-  
lief of any true Article. Pap if that Man should lay down  
his life for defence of this Heresy, imagining all this while  
that it is the Doctrine of the Church, he would be a true  
and undoubted Martyr.

XIII. If you seie to me thus, I have lernyd that holi  
Writte is so worthi a ground and fundement of oure Feith,  
that noon othe ground or fundement passith it, or is surer to  
be cleven to than is it. Wherefoze, Sir, it wolde seem that  
if y cleve to holi Scripture to take of it my Feith, y am not  
to be blamed, but y am thereyne thank-worthi, forasmuch  
as I conforme me to thiske reule, which God hath purueid  
for to be oure reule in mater of feith, and whom no other reule  
in erthe passith. Sir, that this is trewe y graunt wel,  
namelich as anentis al the feith which holi Writt techith.  
For that this be trewe shal be shewed wel in the Book of  
Feith

Feith in Latyn, oꝛ ellis in the Book of the Churche in Latyn,  
as God wole graunte.

## P A R S II.

Fadir pe hau seide in the X. Chapter of the first parti of  
this pꝛesent Book to alle tho lay men whiche ben obstinat to  
the feith of the Church, that holi Writt is the chief pꝛinci-  
pal ground of all the feith which is contained in holi Writt.  
And treuli fadir p can not undirskonde as pitt but that  
nedis pe must have so seid to them, pf it mygt be holde  
foꝛ trew in eny wise; nameliche sithen pe hau seid to  
them, as pe musten nedis seie to them, and it mygten  
not be lest unseid, that the dewe and rigt literal undirskond-  
ing of holi Writ foꝛ trewe feith to be had. laymen musten  
fetche at the Churche: that is to seie, that the al hool Clergie  
of Dypynite oꝛ of the moze and wittier party thereof. And  
redily p know so moche of her wittis and of her counseilis,  
that ellis if pe hadde not so seid to them, pe schulden la-  
bour in vain; as foꝛ to brynge them into the obedience, into  
which pe ben about by writing of this pꝛesent Book. Also  
resoun thereto money thus. The Churche oꝛ the Clergie  
in delyvering to peple feith which is in holi Writt alleg-  
gith foꝛ thilk delyverance holi Writt, and expowneþ holi  
Writt into thilk feith so delyvered. Wherefoꝛe the Churche  
in that biknows that he hath thilk feith of holi Writ, and  
so not of him self pꝛincipali. Foꝛwhi not of him self originali  
oꝛ groundeli, but of the seid holi Writ as and bifoꝛe; and  
theresofe of holi Writ oziginali and groundeli. And so as  
anentis al seyth contepnyd in holi Scripture the same Scrip-  
ture schulde be pꝛincipali bifoꝛe the Churche. Confirma-  
cionn to the same may be this. If the Churche hadde of  
him self pꝛincipali, groundeli and foundementali al the feith  
which is contepnyd in holi Writt, the Churche wolde not  
and ougte not foꝛ to lene to holi Writt as foꝛ groundyng  
and foundamental teching of thilke feith: neither  
wolde sende eny askers into holi Writt, oꝛ wolde labore to  
expowne holi Writt to them into thilk feith. But the  
Church wolde and ougte to seie to such askers of rigt feith:  
Bileve pe to me, foꝛ that I seie this to be rigt bileve.  
And the Churche wolde not fetche to such askers auctorite  
of a thing longer and of lasse auctorite to the purpos than  
the

the Church is. Wherefore the Church, as it saith bi his owne pretencioun of interesse to expounde holi Writt in touching which is trewe feith, must nedis knowleche that he takith holi Scripture for his better, worthier, higer and groundier foundament of the feith, which feith the Charche teachith by holi Writt, and bi the expōicioun of the same holi Writt. And therfore opene it is that ye have not seid amys in this poure now spoken scyng to laymen. Into the othre contrarie side fadir manye skilis now be maad, that the Churche is principalier and cheefter than is holi Writt, anentis eny feith taugt by holi Writt, and that for VIII. Argumentis, which p can make thereto. Wherefore p doste not but that trouble and discencioun schulen be bitwixe Lay Men and Clerkis, yhe and bitwixe surname Clerkis and othre Clerkis upon this, whether holi Writt or the Churche is cheef and of more power having anentis feithis contempnd in holi Writt: ni lasse thanne pe fadir answer to thiske VIII. Argumentis; and so p can not se but that the mater of this discencioun muste nedis be brougte forth in utteraunce and conicacioun.

Sone p am redi to here thi VIII. Argumentis, and for to answer to them pf I can. Peraventure in the answering to them schal growe in sum thing, wherebi schal be clerid what comparisoun is to be hadde bitwixe holi Writt and the Churche anentis al feith contempnd in holi Writt. And bi so moche p am the leest for to heere thi Argumentis and for to answer to them, bi hou moche thou hast now seid and trounce is, that the treuthe which is now occasion of the comparisoun making bitwixe holi Writte and the Churche mygte not be left unleid and untoold to the Lay Peple neither to Clerkis. And that cause bifoze bi thee alleggid.

Fadir agens this which ye hau allowid bifoze in the X. Chapter to be trewe, that holi Writt is such a ground and foundement of oure Cristen general feith, that noon gretter or bettir or surer to us ground or foundament is for oure Cristen general feith witten in holi Writt, p may argue by VIII. principal Argumentis, of which this is the first. Nothng is to be seid ground to us of oure feith without which thing oure feith mygte have be sufficienci groundid and witnissid. But without holi Scripture now had feith mygte have be to us sufficienci groundid. Wherefore holi

holl Scripture is not to be seid ground of another thing, without which the othere thing may be: and the seconde premiss is to be proved thus. Thoug the Apostlis hadde not writte eny word, yet thei mygten have taugt to othere Clerkis and lay folke the al ful hool feith sufficientli to the bihove of the peple as to ther therof the larning, reporting and remembryng; whiche Clerkis and lay folke so taugt of the Apostlis and outlypyng to the Apostlis mygten have taughten othere Clerkis and lay folke the same al hool feith sufficientli, which surbiving and outlypyng her Teachers mygte have taughte othere folke bothe of the Clergie and of the Tapre the same hool feith sufficientli; whiche folke so taugt also surbiving and outlypyng her Teachers mygten have taugt the same al hool feith sufficientli to othere; and so forth into this present dai without eny wryting maad delivered to folke upon the same feith so taugt. And if this had be don, thanne the feith of ech Larners hadde be sufficientli pnow groundid in her Teachers, and in no Scripture therupon maad. Wherfore it folowith that Scripture is not, ne was not the ground of feith to eny persons bi-laving. That this be trewe which is bifoze takun in the profe of the seconde premiss, that thoug the Apostlis hadde not wrytten eny word, thei mygten have taugt the al hool ful feith to peple sufficientli, y may argue thus. In tyme of the old Lawe it was so that al the bilave contempnd in thilk Lawe was taugt by mouth, and mas leerned by mouth. For whi Exod. the XIII. Chap. whanne it is seid of the paske day, that it schulde be kept perli by the Lawe thanne renning, it is seid ferthe anonoon aftir this: And thou schalt telle to thi sone in that day, and schalt seie: This is it what the Lord dide to me, whanne y gede out of Egipt, and it schal be as a signe in thi honde; and as a memorial bifoze thi igen, and that the lawe of God be ever in thi mouth. For in a stronge honde the Lord ledde thee out of Egipt, &c. Also soone aftir there whanne it is bede that the peple of Jewis schulde halowe to God ech first gendrid thing that openeth the wombe among the sones of Israel as well of Men as of Bestis, thanne it is seid anonoon aftir thus: And whanne thi sone schal aske of thee to morewe, and seie what is this? thou schalt answere to him: In a stronge honde the Lord ledde us out of Egipt of the hous of A-vage. For whanne Pharaos was maad hard, and wolde not delyver



us ; the Lord killid al the first gendrid thing in the londe of Egypt fro the first gendrid of man til to the first gendrid of bestis : Therefore y offre to the Lord al thing of mawle kinde that openeth the wombe, and y agenbie alle the first gendrid thingis of my sones. Therefore it schal be as a signe in thi honde, and as a thing hanged for mynde bfore thi igen. For in a stronge honde he ledde us out of Egypt. Also lpk sentence to this is written Deutro. VI. Chap. of the paske daie kping: and Josue IV. Chap. of the XII. Stooones taken out of the water and sette on drie lond into perpetual remembzance that Jordan was dried. Also Deutr. IV. Chap. it was seid thus: Forgete thou not the wordis which thin igen sigen, and falle thou not from thin herte in alle the daies of thi lyf. Thou schalt teche tho to thi sones and to thy sones sones. Telle thou the day in which thou stodist bfore thi Lord God in Oreb, whanne the Lord spake to me and seid, &c. Also Deutro. XI. Chap. it was seid thus: Putte these wordis in youre hertis and soulis, and hange ye the wordis for assigne in hondis and sette ye bitwixe youre igen, teche youre sones that thei thenke in tho wordis, whanne thou sittist in thi house, and goist in the wey, and liggist down and risist. Thou schalt write tho wordis on the postis and gatis of thi house, that the daies of thee and of thi sones be multiplied in the lond, which, &c. Wherefore bi like skile in tpyne of the newe Lawe the al hool seith mygt have be taugt bi word of mouthe fro oon to an othre into this present day sufficientli. Ferthermoze into pprof or into confirmacioun of the same seid seconde pprempse abailith this, that we seen in summe Monasteries the kunnyng and the fulfilling of certeyn usagis and customes be had forth in perfoones of the Monestarie, and be continued bothe in knowing and in fulfilling sufficientli fro the first Fadirs of the Monestaries unto this present day, and that without eny writyng maad upon the same usagis, but bi discente of word oonli fro persone into persone. Wherefore in lpk maner the kunnyng and the using of al oure hool seith mygte have be hadde and lad and continued sufficientli bi mynde and bi teching of mouthe fro Fadris and Prelatis into her Children and Parischens without eny writyng to be maad therupon. The seconde Argument is this: If it had be done in dede as is nert above argued, that it mygte so have be doon, that is to seie, if it had be so doon that the Apostlis hadden taugt bi word manye Clerkis and manye of the lay folke the hool al ful seith



feith sufficientli; these Clerkis and laifolk furbiſing and out-  
 lpyng to the Apoſtles hadden taught bi word the ſame al hool  
 ful feith to othere Clerkis and laifolk ſucceeding after the deeth  
 of the Apoſtles, and that ſufficientli, and ſo forth into this  
 day: thanne the feith ſo taught bi word and ſo deſcending bi  
 word fro perſonys into perſonys into this preſent day ſuf-  
 ficientli, hadde be ſufficientli groundid in the Clergie ſo tang-  
 ten to othere. Thoug therwith a Scripture hadde be maad  
 and delphered forth bi the Apoſtles upon the ſame feith ſo bi  
 word taught to othere. But ſo it was indeede that the Apo-  
 ſtles taugten othere Clerkis the ful al hool feith bi word ſuf-  
 ficientli, and the Clerkis ſo taught of the Apoſtles ſufficientli  
 taugten othere Clerkis ſucceeding after them the ſame al hool  
 feith, and that bi word ſufficientli, and ſo forth continuali in-  
 to this preſent day. Wherefore the al hool ful feith bothe in  
 the tyme of the Apoſtles and alwey ever ſithen was groun-  
 did ſufficientli in the Clergie for the tyme bepng and lpyng,  
 and bi the maner now ſeid teching and delpheryng. And  
 thanne ſerth it ſolowith thus. If the Clergie for the tyme  
 being bi ther ſuch now ſeid teching and delpheryng was and  
 is ſufficient ground for our feith for al tyme ſithen the daies  
 of the Apoſtles: it ſolowith at the leſt that for to loke after  
 or ſette any othere thing as is Scripture, everp othere thing  
 to be ground of the ſame feith after Chriſtis teching bi word,  
 and ſithen the teching of the Apoſtles bi word is no nede. The  
 firſt prempliſe of this ſecunde principal argument is open  
 pnow to be trewe, and the II. Prempliſe of the ſame argument  
 ſehal be proved thus. Chriſt hade to hiſe Apoſtles Match. the  
 laſt Ch. thus, Go ye therefore and teche ye alle folkis, baptizing  
 them in the name of the Fadir and of the Sone and of the Holi  
 Gooſt: teching them to keep alle thingis whatever thingis y have  
 comaundid to you; and alſo Mark the laſt Chap. Chriſt bede to  
 hiſe Apoſtles thus, Go ye into al the World, and preche ye  
 the Goſpel to every creature: and anon after it is ſeid there  
 thus, Thei forſothe goyng forth prechiden every where. But ſo  
 it is, that the Apoſtles hadden not fulfilled this now ſeid  
 Comaundement maad to them bi Chriſt, in laſte than thei  
 hadden prechid bi word of mouthe ſufficientli al the hool feith  
 neceſſarie to be had of the peple. For whi al the hool feith  
 neceſſarie to be had is included in the Goſpel of God, that  
 is to ſeie, in the meſſage of God, which meſſage God ſent  
 into

into the world. Wherefore sothe it is that the Apostlis pre-  
 chiden bi word of mouthe to othere Clerkis and folkis al the  
 hool ful feith sufficientli: and so the secunde bifoze maad prin-  
 cipal p̄missiō to be proved is trewe. The III. principal ar-  
 gument is this, If the Apostlis hadden taugt manye Cler-  
 kis and manye of the laifolk the hool al ful feith bi word of  
 mouthe principali; and these Clerkis and laifolk surbpyng  
 and outlpyng to the Apostlis hadden taugt bi word prin-  
 cipali the same hool feith to othere Clerkis, and to othere  
 folk astir the deeth of the Apostlis, and so forth into this day:  
 thanne the al hool feith so taugt bi word of mouthe prin-  
 cipali and descending bi word principali fro personys into  
 personys into this present day hadde be principali ground-  
 bid in the Clergie whilis the Clergie so taugt othere, thong  
 therewith had be a Scripture maad and despyered forth bi  
 the Apostlis to othere upon the same feith. But so it was  
 in dede that the Apostlis taugten othere Clerkis the hool ful  
 feith bi word principali, and tho clerkis so taugt of the Apo-  
 stlis bi word principali taugten othere clerkis succeeding to  
 them the same al hool feith, and that bi word principali, and  
 so forth continueli into this present day. Wherefore the al  
 hool feith bothe in the tyme of the Apostlis and alwey sithen  
 was groundbid principali in the Clergie for the tyme beynge  
 and lpyng; and bi maner now seid teching and despyer-  
 yng. And thanne ferth it folowith thus, If the Clergie for  
 the tyme beynge bi ther now seid such teching and despyer-  
 yng was and is the principall ground for our feith for al tyme  
 astir the daies of the Apostlis; it folowith at the fulle that  
 to loke astir oʒ seeke astir oʒ seie Scripture to be the prin-  
 cipal ground of our feith, oʒ that Scripture schulde be a prin-  
 cipal ground thereof, oʒ moze necessarie and better grounding  
 of the same feith, thanne is the Clergie of the Church astir  
 the daies of the Apostlis, is waast ydel vanite and untrewe.  
 The first p̄missiō of this III. principal argument is pleyn  
 enoug to be trewe. And for p̄ofe of the II. p̄missiō of this  
 III. principal argument may be maad the same argument,  
 which bifoze is maad for p̄ofe of the II. p̄missiō of the II.  
 principal argument, and that bi the reherciō Certis of Mat.  
 the last chapter, and Mark the last chapter. The IV. prin-  
 cipal argument is this, The Church of Crist which be foun-  
 did on erthe, and of which he is the heed, is alwey and al-  
 tymes

tymes oon and the same, as S. Paul witnesseth. where he seith  
 that to man to have by the same oon Wyf undeptabill signi-  
 feth Crist to have oon Church for his spouse. And the same  
 witnesseth the Clergie bi the promys of sequencis, whiche he  
 singeth in the Masse of Dedication feest day, and in the  
 VIII. day of the same feest, and this same is comounli alle-  
 gorized upon this Text Cant. Oon is mi Dove. But so it  
 was that in the tyme of the Apostolis the Church of Crist  
 in erthe bi his principal party which was the Clergie, was of  
 so greet worthinesse and auctorite and dignite, that he thanne  
 more groundid the feith of Crist, than Scripture groundid  
 feith of Crist thanne. For whi the Apostolis thanne beyng  
 the Clergie of Cristis Church groundid more Cristis feith  
 than ther writyng maad and witen bi them groundid as  
 thanne the same feith: in as moche as the effect of a cause  
 dooth not so moche in to another effect as doith the cause of  
 the same effect into the same other effect as a good Philoso-  
 phie. Wherefore it seemeth folowe that the Church of Crist  
 now being, and at al tyme a this side the Apostolis for the  
 tyme being is and was of great worthinesse, auctorite and  
 dignite, that he now more groundith the feith of Crist than  
 Scripture groundith now the same feith. Sithen oon and  
 the same Church is now and thanne, and therefore bi like  
 stile the same Clergie of the Church is now which was  
 thanne. The V. principal argument is this, The Clergie of  
 the Church dispensith with the thing which holi Scripture  
 forbiddith. For whi the Pope geveith leeve to a Bigam, that  
 is to seie to a man that hath be twies weddid, to be a De-  
 bene and a Priest, notwithstanding that holi Scripture for-  
 biddith it. 1 Thi. 3. 2. But so it is that the lesse worthi resfreyneth  
 not the worthier, neither lowseth the buidingis of the worthier.  
 Wherefore the Clergie of holi Church is worthier myghtier  
 and of gretter auctorite than is holi Scripture, or at the leest  
 the Clergie is of evene worthinesse, even power, and myghte  
 and of auctorite with holi Scripture of the newe Testament.  
 The VI. principal argument is this, The Church of Crist bi  
 his cheef party the Clergie now and al tymes hath power  
 to expowne, declare and interprete holi Scripture, thoug holi  
 Scripture omethe to be undirsonde in the sence and undirsond-  
 ing of God. But so it is that even peer hath power into his  
 rebe peer as the comoun wel allowid proverbe; neither the  
 lesse

lesse worthi hath power on his worthier, as may be taken of Paul, Heb. 7. chap. where he seith, That the lesse worthi is blessed of the more worthi. Wherfore it seemeth that the Clergie and the Chirche bi his party, which is the Clergie is more worthi than is holi Scripture. The VII. principal Argument is this, What ever thing nedith to have upon him self an interpreter or a declarer, nedith to have the same thing as his overseer and worthier. But so it is, that holi Scripture nedith to have of him self an interpreter and a declarer, which is the Clergie in erthe, as for to schewe which is the dewe understanding of holi Scripture. Wherfore holi Scripture nedith to have the Clergie is to be to holi Scripture an overseer and to him as a worthier. The VIII. Argument is this, What ever thing the Apostlis settiden in the comune Crede is to be bileeved and to be holden and used of alle Cristen. But the Apostlis settiden in the comune Crede this Article, that is, for to bileeve to the general holi Chirche in erthe. Wherfore nedis it is to bileeve to the universal or general holi Chirche in erthe. And we molve in noon othere wise bileeve to holi Chirche in erthe than we bileeven to the Clergie of the general Chirche in erthe, for as myche as the Clergie is the principal parti of holi Chirche in erthe. Wherfore it folowith that nedis we must bileeve to the Clergie of the general Chirche in erthe. And if the Clergie ougten in eny dede be bileeved, he ougte be bileeved in his dede whanne he determyneth eny Article to be taken as seith. For as myche as this dede is oon of the grettist aviseable dedis, which the Clergie dooth. Wherfore alle Cristen owen for to bileeve to the determynacioun of the Clergie thoug he determynne agens holi Scripture. No fadir these VIII. Argumentis þ have gadered togidere for to be assolid bi poure hige wisdom.

## C A P. II.

**S**ome thi seid VIII. Argumentis ben right welcome to me. For me thenkith the answer and the assolling of them with Goddis grace schal do good. The II. premisse of the same first principal Argument, whanne it is seid thus, Without holi Scripture our nowe had seith mygte have be to us sufficientli groundid is fals, for to speke of kindeli mygte in our side and in our Soulis without greet singular inpracle of God.



God above kind to have be doon in oure resouns and mynde.  
 And it is moost convenient in this purpos to speke. And  
 whanne for proof of this II. p[re]miss it is argued thus, Though  
 the Apostles hadden not write eny word, yitt thei myghten  
 have taugt to othere Clerkis and layfolk the hool al ful feith  
 sufficientli, so thei this is fals. for whi a feith is not taugt  
 to a peple sufficientli, but if it be taugt so that bi thilk te-  
 ching thei moove cleerli undirstonde al it, and eslii repozte al  
 it, and remembre al it perfeli and currauntli, and kunne re-  
 herce it and talk it in a stable foorm of wordis without va-  
 riaunce maad in wordis and procesis whanne it is at dyverse  
 tymes rehercid. And but if thei moove have recours therto  
 and to ech popnt therof rebeli whanne eny nede schal aske.  
 And for thei for to speke of al the hool ful feith wrytten in the  
 Gospels and Epistles it may not in this seid wise be taugt,  
 without that it be write, and but if the wryting therof be de-  
 lyphered to the Clergie. Wherefore oure al hool feith which  
 is now bitaken to us in Scripture, mygte never bi kinde  
 have be taugt sufficientli to eny peple without therof the Scrip-  
 ture: and though ful manye a processe withynne the boondis  
 of the Gospels ben lawe of resoun and of kinde, yitt this that  
 Crist taugt it and rehercid it is feith: and so the al hool  
 feith wrytten in the Gospels is oon long a tale for to be suffi-  
 cientli learned without therof the wryting. And therefore si-  
 then neither the Apostles neither eny othere Clerkis myghten  
 have taugt sufficientli the seid feith without Scripture, and  
 the peple mygte not bi stupying in the Scripture have learned  
 without techers; it folowith nedis that holi Scripture is  
 more woorthi ground of our feith than is eny congregacioun  
 of the Clergie. O my Sone, if thou woldist take hede hou  
 a tale or a fiding bi the tyme that it hath runne theiung IV.  
 or V. mennys mouthis, takith pacchis and cloutis, and is  
 chaunged in divers parties, and turned into lesingis, and  
 al for defaulte of therof the wryting: and hou that langagis  
 whos reulis ben not wrytten, as ben englissh, freensh and ma-  
 ny othere ben chaungid withynne peecis and cuntrees, that  
 non man of the oon cuntree and of the oon tyme mygte not and  
 schulde not kunne undirstonde a man of the othere kuntre  
 and of the othere tyme, and al for this, that the seid langagis be  
 not stabili and foundementali wrytten: thou schuldist ful soone  
 and ful sikirli deeme, and so schulde ech wel avisid man deeme,  
 that.



that the long tale of the Gospels mygte never bi eny long tyme  
be truli and astir oon maner toolde and reportid and remem-  
brid of dyvers folke without therof the wyting : but manye  
a cloute schulde therto be sette, and manye a good pece therof  
be takin away, and moche stryf schulde ther be about the trewe  
rehercel therof, as which were trewe rehercel therof and which  
were not so : but if the same long tale of the Gospels were  
wyte. And therfore there may no teching of the Clergie ground  
wel & sufficientli to us oure seid feith. And pitt the wyting  
maad and purcheted bi God and bi the Apostlis, and bi the Apo-  
stlis heerers of thiske same long tale may grounde sufficientli  
the same feith in ech Clerk or Lay-man notabili resoned for  
to understonde what he redith in the newe Testament, though  
he not lerne the same feith bi eny general Counseil, or eny  
multitude of Clerkis tokider to be gaderid, though peraventure  
he schal have nede at some while and in some texts of the seid  
Scripture seche to have expositioun hadde bi the eldist party  
of the Churche jomed to the Apostlis and lyving in tyme of  
the Apostlis, as so schal be taugt in the book of Feith in Latyn  
and in the book of the Chirche. Verily as y may trouble tho-  
roug al the tyme of werre during these XL. peere bitwixe  
Ynglond and Fraunce, wisse y not scant III. or IV. men, whiche  
wolde accorde thozug out in telling hou a toum or a castel  
was wonne in Fraunce, or hou a batel was doon, the though  
thilk men were holden rigt feithful men and trewe, and thoug  
ech of them wolde have swoze that it was trewe what he tolde,  
and that he was present and sawe it. Wherfore bi all resoun  
in lyk maner it wolde have be and was in dede of the report  
of the dedis and wordis of Christ, eer thei were witen bi the  
Evangelistis. And that in dede it was so theynne witnessith  
Luk in the prolog of his Gospel, and seith that therfore he was  
movid for to wyte the Gospel which he wyrote. And so bi lyk  
skile for the same cause the othere Evangelistes gave them to  
wyting. Hou ever therfore mygte it have be wel and trewe  
of oure feith, if it schulde have come to us bi reposte of heer-  
ing, and bi mouth speking without therof the wyting. Also  
what that ever eny counseil of Clergie, or eny Clergie without  
gadering into counseil techith as feith, even the Clergie re-  
ferrith his so maad teching of feith into holi Scripture. And  
therfore needis the holi Scripture is moze worthi ground for  
oure feith, than is the Clergie of the hool chirche on erthe. And

And if thou wolt wite of what Scripture y meene, certis it is the writting of the volds Testament and of the newe Testament. For it witnesseth al the feith or ellis at the lest wel nigh al the feith, which Crist teachith of us. The and the writting of the newe Testament confermeth al the volds Testament in that, that the writting of the newe Testament referrieth us oft into the writting of the volds Testament; as Matt. XXVI. ch. Mark XII. and Mark XIV. John I. Luke XXIV. John V. XVII. XIX. and XX. and in manye placis of the Epistlis of the newe Testament. Ferthermore sone not onli the writting of the al hool feith in the Gospels is so necessarie to the peple being a this side the Apostlis, but also the same writting maad and writen of the Apostlis were rigt necessarie as bi wep of kinde and of resoun to the same Apostlis, that bi the writting of the Apostlis whiche thei wroten, thei himself migten holde in mynde the multitude of tho trouthis there writen. And that bi recurse to be maad of them into the seid writting lest that therof the perfigt mynde schulde bi kinde falle away from them, whilis thei were so moche in dyverse troublis occupied. And so therfore ful opene it is, that the writting of oure feith is moze necessarie ground to us for oure feith, than is eny congregacioun of Clerkis biganne sithen the deeth of the Apostlis. For answer to the Certis bifoze alleggid of the volds Testament in the first argument it is to be seid that thoug bi tho Certis it is had sadris schulden teche bi mouth ther sones and ther sones sones the lawis of God and the benefits of God. Pitt bi tho Certis it is not hadde that thilk to be doone bi mouthe schulde have besufficient teching to tho sones and sones sones without writting: and therfore tho textis maken not into the entent, into which the first argument them alleggid. Namelich sithen in the processis of the same Certis it is had among that it is bede with al this that the sadris schulden teche ther sones bi mouthe, it is had in the last of tho Certis, that is to seie Deutron. XI. that tho same sadris and alle the peple schulde have Goddis lawis and Goddis benefits in writting. For whi it is seid there that thei schulden have tho lawis and benefits bifoze ther igen. And this is ynoug for answer to tho Certis. Moze thing accordyng to this answer and conseeemyng it thou maist se sone in the booke of lernyng in thi vulgar tunge. But thanne sadir if it was so necessarie writting to be had upon Christen feith, whi was writting of oure feith so long tyme

deferrid eer it was maad by the Apostlis, as that Matthew  
 wrote his Gospel in the VII. peere after Cristis ascencion,  
 and Mark wrote in the X. peere after Cristis ascencion, as  
 may be had bi cronickis of Martyn; and Luk wrote after othere  
 writers of the Gospelis, as he seith him self in the prolog of  
 his Gospel. And Jon wrote after alle the othere, as manpe  
 men trowen. Also whi wrote not ech Apostle as wel as  
 summe? Also whi wroten not thei to ech Cuntre? Bone an-  
 swer to thi first questioun may be this. Our Lord is wisest,  
 and he is for to lede us into oure kunning to be had in profita-  
 bilist maner alwey rediest. And for as myche as peple to  
 know bi experience hou necessarie it was to them for to have  
 their feith witten was to them moze profitable than for to  
 knowe it without experience: therfore God so schope that the  
 feith schulde bi a notable time be prechid oonli bi word to the  
 peple, that thei mygten therbi take experience, that preching  
 of the al hool feith bi word oonli were not sufficient without  
 therof the writyng, and thanne that therfore the peple schulde  
 desire to have the feith witten, and the Apostlis schulden se  
 the same treuthe bi experience, and schulden consente for to  
 write to the peple the same feith, which bifore bi parcellis  
 thei prechiden bi word. An othere cause mygte have be this.  
 A precious thing whanne it is lightli and soone gotten without  
 long bifore goyng desire to have it, schal be the lesse sette bi,  
 whanne it is receyved. For as myche as the writyng con-  
 teyning oure al hool feith is preciole, and ougte not be sette  
 litil bi, neither be seyntli and unwoorthili receyved, therfore  
 God so schope that it was long of the peple desirid eer thei it  
 receyveden: as for lxx skille. God differreth ful holi mennys  
 boоныs, for that bi ther long desiring and wyng and abiding  
 after it thei schulden the moze joie have, and the moze thanke  
 God, whanne thei it receyveden. An othere cause remynng  
 herewith mygte be that the Apostlis hadden not greetist letters  
 for persecuciouns, that thei mygten anon in the bigynnyng  
 have witten, and peradventure longe tyme in the bigynnyng the  
 Apostlis prechiden not, neither mynysstriden to the peple but  
 a fewe articles of feith: as were these of Cristis comyng, and  
 of his incarnacioun, and of the cause whi he came. And longe  
 tyme nymethis mygte suffice for to bringe the peple into con-  
 sent and bileve of these fewe feithis. Also scolers in ech  
 kinde of scole schulden not be oppressed in the bigynnyng of  
 ther

ther scole with obermanne maters to be mynistrid to them at  
 oonys or suddenli or oversoone. And therfore a good while  
 bi peeris scolers in the scole of cristendoom herden peeres mele  
 the feith prechid eer the hool summe and birden therof was  
 delphered to them bi wryting. And thus myche for answer  
 to thi first questoun. If it be trewe that Joon the Eban-  
 gelist wrote his Gospels eer than it is seid that he wrote; and  
 so that he wrote his Gospel bifoze his coming from exile, as  
 therto may be hadde grāt mōrve bi the wrytyngis of Sepit  
 Denis Arcopagite, bi cause Joon hadde writen his Gospels  
 eer Denys wrote hise bookis. Thanne answere to the secunde  
 questoun may be this. Right as what is necessarie to a  
 comonute is to be purbeid foze: so what is waast and com-  
 herole and chargeole to a comonute is to be left of, and to be  
 avoidid. And for as much as whanne Mathew, Mark, Luk,  
 and Joon haden writen, the othere Apostlis sithen these wry-  
 tingis, and sithen these wrytingis were sufficient to expresse  
 the coming of Crist, the birth of Crist, the lyping of Crist,  
 the teching of Crist: and therfore the othere Apostlis wolden  
 not as for the same maters combe the pepilis wittis with  
 eny more wrytingis therupon. And that what oon Apostle  
 or a Disciple wrote, alle the othere Apostlis and Discipulis  
 knewen. We motwe take mark bi this, that Petir in his Epi-  
 stil the lasse knowlechith that he wiske of Poulis wryting; and  
 bi a greet liklihood he knewe what the othere wryters wroten:  
 and bi as myche greet liklihood Poul wist what Petir wrote,  
 and what ech othere wryter wrote; and therfore he himsilf  
 wrote for Gospel, but helde him content with the Gospels  
 writen of othere. Namelich sithen Luk was felowe to Poul in  
 mych of alle Poulis labouris, and therfore to Poul mygte not  
 be straunge and unwise the wryting of Luk. And also that it  
 was not to Poul unknowen, it seemeth wel herbi. For in the  
 first Epistle to Corinthians the XI. ch. Poul reherrerith the processe  
 of Luk the XXII. ch. wel nyg word bi word. And thus myche  
 done for answer to thi II. questoun. To thi III. questoun y  
 answere thus, The Apostlis knewe wel as thei mygten wel  
 knowe bi resoun, that the wryting of oure general feith wole  
 serve like wele to peple of each cuntre, as to peple of oon run-  
 tre; and thei wisten that the oon same wryting mygte and  
 schulde renne from oon cuntre into another cuntre, like as  
 Poul in his Epistle to the Colociens biddith that thilk same



Epistle schulde be rabbe to the peple which ben callid Laodoces. And therfore it was none be to make to dyverse cuntries dyverse wrytingis in this wise dyvers; that thei schulden conceyve dyverse maters, thoug the wryting of oon and the same mater mygite be wryten or translatid into dyverse langagis. And thus is the III. questioun assailed. Fadir perceyve wel hou pe hab declarid ful wel that what was taken to prove the seid II. pemyssie in the first principal argument is untrew, and therfore it is to be denyed. But pe hab not answerid to the argumentis for the prof of it what was so taken in to the prof of the same seid II. pemyssie. Therfore Fadir answer pe to them. Fone the first argument bifoze maad for prof of it what was taken to prove the seid II. pemyssie, goith upon processis and textis of the oold Testament, whiche prove no thing the entent whitherto thou bringist them in thine argument. For whi tho textis wole no more than this, that God wolde the oold Lawe and the oold Feith be learned bi heering of word. But certis herof folowith not that God wolde or mened it to be learned so and in lyk maner sufficientli. And therfore the textis hurten not myn entent, neither thei proven the entent wherfore thou broughtist them forth into thyn argument. Also the contrarie, that is to seie, that God mened thilk lernynge bi word herd was not sufficient to the Clergie therynne and to the peple thanne; apperith wel bi this, that God bede the oold Lawe to be wryten, and forto so bidde had be yvel and in deyn, if the teching and the lernynge of the same Lawe bi word onli hadde be sufficient. To the II. argument maad into the same entent p answer thus. Thoug a fewe usagis and customes in monestaries molwe be born in mynde without wryting; hou schulde therof folowe that so long a tale as is the storie of the IV. Gospels mygite be born in mynde bi lernynge of word without therof eny wryting. That this schulde folowe, hath no colour, and therfore thilk argument is fyt to be in this now seid maner answered and assailed.

## C A P. III.

**F**adir agens pou metich this: that the Feith which was in the beginning of the world, and was continued forth in to the daies of Moyses, was not wryten. For whi Moyses which was



was after the beginning of the world bi XX. hundred yeres,  
wrote the booke of Genesis, and it is seid comounli, he wrote  
it bi inspiracioun, and bi such propheticall thingis pas-  
sid ben knowen above power to knowe them bi kinde, and pitt  
thilke feith was a long tale and a long storie, as is opene be  
the booke of Genesis with rehercels ful hard to mende upon ge-  
neraciouns of persons and upon the names of persons.  
Wherefore it seemeth that as wel the stories of the Gospels  
myghte have be sufficientli taught of the Apostles, and have be  
learned of the othere Clergie and of the peple without writing.  
None if thou or any othere man ellis were sike or hadde any  
greet liklihood herto, and greter than to the contrarie, that  
there was no writing of the feith in the eldis tyme fro the bi-  
gynnyng of the world into the flood of Noe, and fro thennes  
into the writing of Moyses, thin argument were stronge. But  
certis noon such sikernes neither any such liklihood to the  
contrarie is had. For whi soon after the flood of Noe there was  
lernyng of the VII. Sciencis, and writing therof maad in II.  
pylers, oon of brasse and another of erthe: and also in the same  
tyme there was lernyng and writing of Whichecraft or of  
Speromancie, as the Maistir of Stories \* writith in the Cha-  
ptere of the Towe of Babel. And if worldli men in that tyme  
were so bis in worldli lernyng and writing; it is not to be  
trowid but yk bi were summe of manye goosli men in le-  
rnyng and writing of goosli maters pertynyng to the feith  
and the service of God and to the end wherto man was maad.  
Wherefore it is moze likli that in the daies soone after the flood  
of Noe there was writing of feith pertynyng to God and to  
mannys governyng and ending: than that there was noon  
such in the daies anon after the flood of Noe. Also long be-  
fore the flood of Noe Ennok founde lettris and wrote booke is,  
as the Maistir of Stories seith. And this Ennok was a passing  
holy man, as the Bible witnessith. And he lyved in the  
daies of Adam. Wherefore sithen it is so that such as a man  
is, such is his lernyng, studyng and writing: it is moze  
likli that he wrote holi wondrous thingis of the feith. And  
namelich sithen he lyved in the daies of Adam, which coude ful  
myche teche Ennok what he schulde write in such mater, than  
that he wrote any othere worldli thing donli. And sithen Noe  
was a ful holi man, it is likeli that he hadde and kept sum  
and myche of this writing with him laas in his schippe whi-

\* Peter  
Cornelior.

lis the flood durid namelich sithen he pzechid an hundrid wintre to the peple eer the flood came that thei schulde leeve ther synne. And certis suche pzeching coude not have be doon without greet kummpng of ful goosli thingis. And also it muste be bi alle liklihood that Ennok delpyvered to his owne Sone Mathussale the same goosli wryting which Ennok wrote. And this Mathussale the Sone of Ennok lyvede with Noe six hundrid wintre: and therfore it is to be seid that Noe hadde ful myche and hige kummpng of feith and of his wryting. For so good a man as Noe was, wolde not leeve unalpyed so profitabile a wryting. And what he had so profitabili in wryting he kept saaf in his schipp, and delpyvered astir to hise Sones Sem, Cam, and Japheth, which Sem clepid othertwise Melchisedeck lyved in the daies of Abraham. Wherfore Abraham bi diligenge of his holynesse schapide him to receyve the same wryting of Sem. And bi liklihode Abraham bitooke it to Ysaac, Ysaac to Jacob, and Jacob to hise Sones: and hou likli it is that Ennok wrote what he leerned of Adam perteyning to God and to Men, so likli is it that Noe or sum othere wrote what he leernyd of Matussale, that selle in the daies of Ennok and of Matussale: and Sem or sum othere in the daies of Sem wrote what he leernyd of Noe that selle in the daies of Noe. And Abraham or othere in hise daies wrote what he herd of Sem that selle in the daies of Sem, which was clepid Melchisedeck. For whi even liklihode was of ech of these casis, as was in eny oon of them. And so at the lasse Moyses gaderid al this togidder, and maad a booke therof which is clepid Genesis. And certis this is more likli bi storie bifoze allegid and bi resoun togidere, than forto sei that Moyses had bi inspiracioun without eny manys bifoze gobun to him informacioun. Namelich sithen we owen for to not seyne forge allegge but the trowe, nor holde eny mpracle to be doon, save whanne nebe compellith us therto: that is to seie, that we mowe not save the caase othertwise bi liklihode of resoun for to seie that Moyses hadde sufficient informacioun bifoze of wrytings, thoug he schulde make the booke of Genesis, than is liklihode to this that he had noon such now seid informacioun. Therfore in this case it is not to renne into mpracle, thoug divers doctouris in this case, and in special Gregory upon Ezechiel, without myche avisement, and soon moved bi devocioun so doon. Also of sum thing doon bifoze the flood of Noe, wherof

no mentioun is maad in the writing of Moyſes, we have know-  
 ing in ſtoꝛies, as of this, that Lamech was an hunter and  
 dyumme of ſigt, and that he was lad bi a pong man in hunt-  
 ing, and that he ſchotte Cayn bi dꝛeſſing of the ſeid leder.  
 Of this thing ſo untaugt in Moyſes writing we mygte not  
 have had knowing, if there had not be eny writing biſoꝛe  
 Noes flood of thingis which biſelle biſoꝛe the ſame flood. Wher-  
 ſoꝛe ſuch writing of ſtoꝛies was biſoꝛe Noes flood. And thanne  
 ſerthe if ſuch ſtoꝛping of woꝛldli chauncis was writen biſoꝛe  
 Noes flood: moche rather ſtoꝛping of woꝛthi gooſili thingis  
 was writen biſoꝛe the ſame flood. And if this be tꝛue,  
 thanne ſuche writen ſtoꝛies weren kept ſaaf bi Noe in his  
 ſchippe foꝛ ſkile biſoꝛe maad: and ſo thei came aftirwarde  
 into the knowing of Moyſes, as is biſoꝛe argued: and Moyſes  
 compiled the book Genesis out of them: and whanne the  
 bokis of Moyſes were hadde, the othere bokis fallen out  
 of uſe, as it is likli to biſall; foꝛ ſo it fallith in othere lꝛk  
 caſis. ¶ Fadir me thenketh ye holden a ful reaſonable wey  
 in this mater, and ſuch a wey, which hath moze likli eꝓden-  
 cis foꝛ it, than hath the contrari party. Therfoꝛe poure wey  
 ougte bi lawe of kinde, and undir perel of vice and of ſynne  
 be holden, till gretter eꝓdence be founden to the contrarie,  
 thanne ben the eꝓdencis making foꝛ this party. But certis  
 out of this ſolowith, as ſemeth to me, that we ſchulde holde  
 this party, that Eldras reneuid not the oold Teſtament in  
 writing bi gift of inſpiracioun, as is comounli holde: but  
 that he reneuid the oold Teſtament in this wiſe, that he  
 maad be writen and multiplied manye bookis of the oold  
 Teſtament manye mo than there were biſoꝛe, and that foꝛ  
 ze le which that he hadde to this that Goddis Lawe ſchulde  
 be wel knowe, thoug of ech kinde of tho Bookis ſunn Co-  
 pie was biſoꝛe. Foꝛ whi like eꝓdencis ben that Eldras  
 hadde Copies of the oold Lawe, as ben eꝓdencis that Moyſes  
 hadde Copies foꝛ to write oꝛ compile bi them the Book  
 of Genesis. The gretter eꝓdencis to holde this now ſeid  
 affirmative party, thanne ben eꝓdencis foꝛ to holde the  
 contrarie negative party. Some y holde wel with thi  
 concept in this mater, and the eꝓdencis therto ben theſe.  
 Hou eber ꝓbel the Peple of Jewis at eny tyme was, ꝓt  
 thei were never without ſumme holi lovers and keepers of the  
 ſame among them. Foꝛ whi whanne grettifi ꝓdolatrie was  
 uſid

used in Jewry in the daies of King Achab so far forth, that the  
 Prophete Hely webed and seid to God, That of alle the Jewis  
 there was noon but he al oon left alyve which lovdy and kept the  
 Lawe. The Lord answerid to Hely and seid, (that it was not  
 so, for he kept to him he seide) More than five hundrid in Israel,  
 whiche never bowid ther knees to Baal. That is to seie, to the  
 fals God, which in the daies was worschapid openli thozug  
 al Israel. And if this was trewe in the daies of grettist ydolatrie,  
 that there was manye pryvev lovers and keepers of the  
 Lawe; bi like skile it schulde be trowid, that in ech othere  
 tyme there weren suche loders and keepers of the Lawe. And  
 in lyk it was in ech tyme whanne Jerusalem was in tralidon  
 bi enemyes withoutforth, and whanne the Jewis weren tran-  
 slatid into Babilonye, and whilis thei dwelliden there. But so  
 it is, that no man lettrid wolde caste him to be urri knower  
 of the Lawe, and therfore an urri keeper therof, but that he  
 wolde caste him to have the same lawe in wyting. Wherfore  
 in alle tymes of the Jewis, both whilis thei were in the lond  
 of Israel, and whilis thei were in the lond of Babilonye, there  
 were among summe of them bokis writen of the lawe and used  
 of them; thoug the lawe writen in summe bokis was byent in  
 the byemping of the Temple. Also Jeremye lyvede and abode  
 in Jerusalem, whilis the last and grettist captivite of the citee  
 was maad, and whilis the Jewis weren laste translatid, and  
 the temple was destroyed, and herof he profieied, and wrote his  
 Prophecie a littil before at this grettist and last captivite was  
 don. And after that this captivite was don, he abiding  
 in Jerusalem with the resak and restail of the Jewis, wrote his  
 book clepid the Trens. But al this was not likeli to be, if  
 Jeremye schulde not have had with him the Book of the Lawe,  
 into the keeping of which lawe he so often preachid and stirid  
 the people. Wherfore it is to be trowid that Jeremye had with  
 him alwey writen a book of the lawe; thoug sum book con-  
 teyning the same lawe was byent in the temple. And for lyk  
 skile it is to be trowid that Ezechiell hadde also the lawe wri-  
 ten, which Ezechiell lyved in tyme of this grettist and last  
 thraldom, and was caried into Babilonye fro Jerusalem with  
 the greet route. And in Babilonie the fift pere of this thraldom  
 he bigan to prophete there in Babilonie. Also sumwhat bi-  
 fore the thraldoms of Jerusalem the King Joas maad the book of  
 of the lawe be knowun, and he publishid ful myche, which  
 long



long before was unknown as to the Priestis and to the more multitude of the people. Wherefore it is lyk that in this Kingis daies there were writen in greet numbze manye bokis of the lawe. Nameli sithen the people were thanne brought into a greet debocioun anentis the lawe, as it is open. Also in ech tyme of Jewis there weren summe Prophetis, as may be taken bi the prologgis of Jerom into the bokis of Prophetis, and also bi the text: and to them it longid to not be unknowers of the lawe, inas moche as God comaundid his lawe to be of his people knowun. And without writing such to long a law mygte not be knowun. Wherefore at alle daies of the Jewis both in Israel and in Babilonie there were bokis al redi of the same writen. And herto wolde serbe ful openli the storie of Thobie, and the story of Susanne, Daniel 13. ch. ne were that thei ben Apocryfis. Also Daniel, Eldras, Neomyas, Zorobabel, Mardoche, Hester, and othere were keepers of the lawe, whilis thei weren freeli in Babilonie inhabiting, as the storie of the Bible makith mencion. Wherefore it is like that thei hadden the lawe writen, namelich sithen thei mygten sende and have messages to and fro Jerusalem and Babilonie. And if al this be trewe, certis it is likli ymoug, that Iohanne Eldras and Zorobabel came fro Babilonie into Jerusalem for to bilde agen the citee and the temple: thei hadden bokis al redi writen of the lawe; and thanne herof folowingly this that Eldras renewid the five bokis of Moyles and alle the stories in to hise daies, is to be understonde thus: that he wrote or wroteid or ordeyned to be writen and multiplied manye bokis of the same lawe in great numbze, wherof was not but fewe before. And if this be trewe, as it hath more likeli evidencis to be trowid for trewe than hath his contrarie party: it followith that for to seie this whiche summe Doctouris cōmounli holden with the Maistie of stories, that Eldras bi inspiration wrote without eny copie alle the five bokis of Moyles, and alle the othere bokis of stories and of propheties in to hise daies, is not but a seyned thing. For it is leid without sufficient therto scripyng evidencis. And therefore this seid opinioun of Eldras his writing bi priuey miraculis inspiracioun, is worthi to be leid a side. Namelich sithen to priuey miraculis we schulde not reime for to defend oure opinion or oure answer bi them without that sufficient evidence therto serbeth. For ellis there mygte noon opinioun be over-



ouercome bi strengthe of argument, hou faile so eber the opinioun were: so that he included no repugnance, such as God mygte not do bi myracle.

## C A P. IV.

**F**Adir, aftir alle this, what is seid for answere to the first principal argument, and what is sunken in bi occasioun of the same answere, it is now tyme the pe biginne answere to the second principal argument. Sone, thou seist sooth, and therfore as for answere to the second and third principal argumentis togidere, the second pzempsse in eber ech of them is to be denyed. Forwhi sithen bi answere maad to the first principal argument it is declarid that the Apostolis mygten not without wryting teche sufficientli oure al hool ful seith, wherof nowe is the newe Testament writen, it solewith that thei taugten not without wryting sufficientli the same seid al hool ful seith, whiche is agens and contrarie to the second pzempsse of the second principal argument. Peither thei taugten without wryting principali the same al hool ful seith which is agens and contrarie to the second pzempsse of the third principal argument. And that for as myche as what the Apostolis mygten not do sufficientli or principali, thei diden not sufficientli neither principali. And so as now p bifoze seid, the bothe second pzempsles in the second and third principal argumentis ben to be denyed. Ferthemore thoug Christ bede as thou allegist Matt. and Mark the last chapitris, hise Apostolis to pzeche al the hool Gospel, and so al the hool seith to ech creature by parcel mel in word speking of dyvers tymes, and thoug thei fulfillid this Comaundement, pitt herof so lowith not that Crist has herpene bade them pzeche the Gospel and the al hool seith as sufficientli or principali to be doon. For Crist wolde that a good pzeching not sufficient neither principal schulde go bifoze the teching ful and sufficient and principal: which principal and sufficient teching aftirward schulde be doon bi wryting ponli, or ellis bi word and wryting togidere. For as the Philosophie seith, kind in his woeking beginneth fro imperfyt pzeeding and growing into perfyt: and man dooth in the same wise in hise werkis of craft. And thoug God the Auctoz and maker of kinde doin same wise in hise Werkis, as it is not to be wondrid, but it

is to be wel prised. Forwhi in that his woerking accordith  
wel with oure resoun. And so the two premisses in this bothe  
argumentis maad for proving of the two principal premiss-  
es in the second and third principal argumentis be not  
groundid upon the textis of Mathew and Mark in ther last  
Chapitris, and ben to be denied. And this wise sufficient  
answere is maad to the second and to the third principal argu-  
mentis togidere. For answer to the fourth principal argu-  
ment thou schalt understonde that Paul seith ad Ephes. ch. IV.  
thus : Oon is the Lord, oon seith, and oon Baptim. And vitt the  
baptim of this man here in Ynglond is not the same baptim  
in being and in kinde, which is the baptim of anothere man in  
Fraunce. For ech man as he is dyvers in being fro ech o-  
there man, so his baptim and his sacramental waiching is  
dyvers in being fro ech othere mannys baptim and waiching  
in water. Nevertheless this baptim of this man in Yn-  
glond is oon in significacioun and in representacioun with ech  
othere mannys baptim in Fraunce. Forwhi alle the baptims  
and sacramentis are oon thing, which is this as Paul seith,  
Rom. 6. That ech man owith be deed and buried to alle synnijs and  
rise into a new lyf in clennes of verty. Also in lpk maner the  
Chirche of Ynglond is oon Chirche with the Chirche of  
Fraunce, but hou, certis not in being, in kinde and in sub-  
staunce. Forwhi the peple being here is not the peple being  
there. But thei ben oon in reputacioun of auodite of seith,  
of power, and of iurisdiccioun. That is to seis, for the oon  
of these Chirchis hath lpk power and iurisdiccioun to the  
othere goven to them fro God. And in lpk maner it is to be  
understonde whanne it is seid that the Chirche whiche now  
is, is the same Chirche which was this same tyme a thousand  
winter, or which was in the daies of the Apostlis : or that  
the Chirche of God is alwey oon nat in being or in kinde or  
substaunce. Forwhi the peple is not now and thanne oon,  
neither alwey oon, but oon in reputacioun. And not in al  
maner reputacioun, but in reputacioun of lpk seith, and of  
lpk power, and of lpk iurisdiccioun goven fro God. But  
certis open it is to ech mannys resoun that thoug the  
Chirche now lyving be in this seid maner of reputacioun  
the same Chirche whiche the Apostlis weren, vitt it nedith  
not to folowe that this Chirche now lyving hath like moche  
kunning and power for to witnes oure seith as hadde the

Chirche, which the Apostlis weren. Neither it folowith that this Chirche now lpyng hath more kunning and powver forto witnesse than hath the writing of the newe testament forto so witnesse: thoug it were so that the Chirche of the Apostlis hadde kunnyng and powver forto so more witnesse. And al herfoze. For this Chirche is not the same Chirche in kinde, in being, and in substance with the othere seid Chirch, right as these persons be not the persons. And thilk Chirche had informacion of the feith bi heering the Apostlis and the Euaungelistis, whiche the Chirche now being hath not, but so sechith aftir forto have bi reiding in the writing of the Apostlis and Euaungelistis. And so, Done, if thou woldist this argument if it were maad to thee: this Chirche now lpyng, and the Chirche of the Apostlis weren oon in the seid reputacioun. Therefore as the Apostlis weren in this degree of holi lpyng and mygten do myracilis, speke with dyvers tungis and write a newe testament, and witnesse that thei sawe Crist do and suffre, and herd him teche; so this Chirche now being is lph holi, and may do lph greet myracilis, may speke with dyverse tungis, and write a newe testament, and witnesse that he sig Crist do and suffre and herde him teche. Even so in lph maner thou schalt be moved forto deme thin owne fourth principal argument that it make no folowing: which argument is this. The present Chirche is allwey oon and the same with the Chirche of the Apostlis. Wherfoze as the Chirche of the Apostlis groundid the feith more than Scripture it groundith; therfoze the Chirche, which now is, groundith more our feith than Scripture it groundith. Hou ever it be of the conclusioun or of the consequent of the argument, which conclusioun or consequent whether it be trewe or no schal be tretid in the boke of the Chirche in Latin. And fethemore, Done, thoug thou woldist putte a successive aggregate of alle the Apostlis and of alle Cristen Men, whiche ever weren ben and schulen be, to be the Chirche of Crist, and therfoze that there is allwey thozoug al tymes oon, and the same Chirche in aggregate being kinde and substance: pitt herof folowith not that hou ever kunnyng holi mygti and worthi this aggregat was in eny time bifoze in hile parties passid, so kunnyng holi mygti and worthi this aggregat is now in hile parties now being: no more than folowith if the successive aggregate mygte as he was thanne in hile

hise parties passid do myraclis, that the same aggregat may do now as he is in hise parties now being : no more than it folowith, if Ynglond sumtyme mygte make such a conquest, therfore he schal be ever a power forto make lke greet conquest. And therfore, Sone, if thi fourth argument be maad in this wise, the hool successive aggregat of Clerkis is now which was in the tyme of the Apostlis ; but in thilk this aggregat was a worthier witnesser of dure feith than was Scripture : therfore so is this aggregat now. Certis this argument is not worth. For he concludith and makith no folowing. Nevertheles, Sone, for to putte and holde such a successive aggregate in kinde in ppropirte without figurative speche is agens good Philosophie, and therfore agens good resoun, and agens trouthe, as ful wel mygte be provyd, if this place were accordyng to trete such mater. But whilis the putting and the holding therof hurtith not my ppresent entent, y wole here lete the treeting therof passe undir suffraunce. For answere to thi fifth principal argument thou schalt understonde that scripture of the newe testament is not thowg ech party of him lke in auctorite in worthines and in dignite. For whi summe parties of Scripture techen to us feith, summe techen to us lawe of kinde and of natural resoun, as the text in it self wel schewith, and Austyn witnessith the same. Nevertheles this that Crist taugt thilk lawe of kinde and of resoun, wherof it is writen in holi writte that Crist them taugte, is feith. For whi, this that he so taugt them cannot be leerned and found bi mannys resoun without therof a teller and a denouncer. Summe parties of the leid scripture techen to us positive ordinauncis of Crist, as ben the sacramentis, and sum partie therof techen to us ordinauncis of sum Apostle, as the lawe of bigamie, and that a woman bove not chasite bifoze the sixtieth peer of hir age. Now, Sone, thoug the Clergie that now is, and thoug the Pope that now is, may dispense with it that the Scripture techith us the ordinaunce of an Apostle and may revoke it, as he may dispense with this that Poul ordeynyd a bigam to not be Deken or Prest : 1 Thim. III. ch. and with this that Poul ordeynyd a widowe to not take perpetual videwife undir boond eer sche be of LX. Winter, and but if sche hadde be wyf of oon man, 1 Thim. IV. ch. yhe and revoke these two pointis ; bicause that the Pope is of lke auctorite and of ju-



restitution with ech oꝛ with the gretest of the Apostles: pitt  
herof folowith not; that the Clergie now lpyng oꝛ the Pope  
now lpyng may dispense with this that Scripture teachith as  
the positive ordinaunce of Crist; and that he may reboke any  
of the ordinauncis. Forsoht to reboke and dispense myghte  
noon of the Apostles. And so thoug the Chirche now lpyng  
be evene in auctorite and power with sum partti of Scripture,  
as with fulfello partties of Scripture, as in this forto make  
positive ordinaunces lph as holi Scripture bi power of the  
Apostle maad, and for to reboke this positive ordinaunce of  
holi Scripture maad by the Apostle: pitt he is not evene in  
auctorite and power with al the Scripture of the New Testa-  
ment, neither with manye othere partties therof. To thi  
sixth argument p answere, graunting the first pemyss, that  
the Chirche now lpyng hath power forto expounde and inter-  
prete and declare the trewe undirstanding of holi Scripture.  
And p deny the second pemyss that even peer hath no power  
into his even peer. Forsoht the suggest hath some power upon  
his. Soberen as for to luke upon him, forto speke to him, and  
forto warne him of hise harms, and forto defend him, and  
such othere. And so the Chirche now being, she and ech  
thristi wel sped student in Divinite hath power forto declare  
and expounde holi Scripture: she and ech good Grammarien  
hath power to construe Scripture, so that as the urri betwe  
literal undirstanding we schulden aske and leerne of a greet  
learned sad Divine, rather than of another yongir and lasse  
learnyd Divine: so we schulde aske and leerne it of the univer-  
sal oꝛ general hool Clergie rather than of any particuler per-  
soone oꝛ persoons save in the execeptionoun spokun of in the  
first partti of this booke in the seventh ch. and in othere chap.  
altir there folowving. And therefore as it folowith not herof  
that ech thristi Divine and ech Grammarien is moze worthi  
for to grounde feith than is holi Scripture, so it folowith  
not that the Chirche now lpyng oꝛ the Clergie now lpyng  
are moze worthi forto grounde feith than is holi Scripture.  
Done, manye kindis of Powers ther ben. The even Peer  
hath no power of constreynyng upon his even Peer: that is  
to seie forto make his even peer to do what he wolde not do  
in thilk kind of werk, in which thei ben evene peers: and  
pitt oon evene Peer may reboke and relese that the othere e-  
vene Peer ordeynyth oꝛ biddith to be do oꝛ doithinde: as we  
seen



sen that oon executour reuokith and releseth what the othere  
 iohed to him executour ordeyneth, biddith or doth, name-  
 lich bi the Lawe of Yngland, and in this case is ech Pope  
 with ech of the Apostles. As for answere to the VII. princi-  
 pal Argument, yf lete that power forto interprete, expoune  
 and declare which is the right sense of Scripture is not but a  
 ful lital power upon Scripture: as power forto construe  
 Scripture after rules of grammer is a ful lital power upon  
 Scripture; but pitt moche lasse than the othere power now  
 spoken. Forwhi so bi these powers no thing is takun alwey  
 fro Scripture what he had bifoze, neither eny thing is sette  
 of the newe to Scripture, what Scripture hadde not bifoze,  
 neither eny thing is comaundid to be or not to be agens the  
 comaunding the or mylling of Scripture. And that because  
 this seid power of interpreting, expownyng, declaring and  
 construyng is not but a power of kunnyng onli for to schewe  
 and make open the thing of Scripture which is in Scripture  
 al redi bifoze thoug priuelt and hid: right as the Prest in Lent  
 tyme drawith the Lent veil, and therbi makith open to the pe-  
 ple what was bifoze in the Auter alredi, thoug not sen of the  
 peple. Wherefore the first Premysse in the VII. principal Ar-  
 gument is untrue and to be denyed, whanne it is seid thus:  
 Whateuer thing nedith to have upon him an Interpreter or  
 Expouner or a Declarer, nedith to have the same thing as his  
 overer and worthier. And whi this is untrue it is now  
 seid. Forwhi ellis a Dekene yf the Perisch Clerk were  
 worthier than the Prest standing at the auter, whanne the  
 Clerk drawith aside the Lent veil. And also if the seid first  
 Premysse were trewe, thanne Scripture were worthier than  
 sche her self is, and sche were overer to hir self, which is re-  
 pugnaunce. For whi Scripture ful oft expownereth hir self  
 bi as moche as bi the reding of Scripture in oon parti a  
 man schal leerne which is the trewe undirstonding of Scrip-  
 ture in al othere parti wherynne he doutid or unknowe bi-  
 foze. Also Sone the Iugis which the King makith in his  
 rewine for to iuge alle cause after the Lawe which he and  
 his Parliament maken, ben not so worthi forto grounde  
 right wisnes in causis as the seid Lawe is. Forwhi al that  
 thei han to iuge right wisnes in causis thei han of this Lawe:  
 and pitt the same seid Iugis han power bi ther greet kun-  
 nyng for to declare what is the trewe entent of the Lawe.

ten oꝝ not wꝛiten, whanne othere not so kunning perſoonys  
 in the Lawe as thei ben doughten therpynne oꝝ not so ſer ſeen  
 therpynne. And therfoze bi lph maner in this preſent pur-  
 poſ it is that thoug the Clergie oꝝ ſum of the Clergie bi ther  
 greet leernynge have power oꝝ kunning ſoꝛto declare to ſim-  
 pler folk which is the urri ſenſe and undirſtanding of Scri-  
 pture: pitt herof ſolowith not the Clergie oꝝ thilk perſoone  
 of the Clergie ſo declaring is worthier in wei of groundynge  
 what Scripture was ordeyned to grounde bi his delwe un-  
 dirſtanding of treuthe, than is the ſame Scripture in him  
 ſilf ſoꝛto grounde. Foꝛ certis it may be that ſum oon ſim-  
 ple perſoon as in fame oꝝ in ſtate is wiſer ſoꝛto knowe  
 juge and declare what is the trewe ſenſe of a certeyn poꝛtioun  
 of Scripture, and what is the treuthe of ſum Article, and  
 that ſoꝛ his long ſtudying, laboꝛynge, and avyſynge therupon,  
 than is a greet general Conceil. Foꝛ whi ful of it is ſeen that  
 oon perſoon in a general Conceil redreſſith al the Conceil fro  
 that, that thei wolden ordeyne, as p have rad. If on ſymple  
 perſoone had not agenſtonde bi hiſe reſounis a general Council  
 wolde have ordeyned that Preſtis ſchulde have be weddid to  
 Wyves if thei wolden. And alſo p have rad in the tre departid  
 ſtoꝛie that if Finucius\* hadde not recleimed in the greet Council  
 of Nice there hadde be ordeyned that tho Preſtis which have  
 had Wyves ſchulden have leſt ther Wyves and ſchulden have  
 be divozced fro hem. Foꝛ anſwere to thi VIII. argument thou  
 ſhalt undirſtonde that it is not oon and the ſame ſoꝛto trowe  
 a thing to be, and ſoꝛto trowe the ſame thing foꝛ whi p may  
 trowe the Solwdan of Babylonye to be, pitt it nedith not ther-  
 foze that p trowe to him. And in lph maner it is not oon  
 and the ſame ſoꝛto bileve a thing to be, and ſoꝛto bileve to  
 thilk thing. Foꝛ whi p may and ougte bileve the ſand to  
 be, and pitt p ougte not therbi ſoꝛto bileve to the fende.  
 Wherfoze it is not oon and the ſame ſoꝛto bileve on univer-  
 ſal Chirche of God in erthe to be, and ſoꝛto bileve to thilk  
 on univerſal Chirche. And ſithen it is ſo that bi thilk Ar-  
 ticle putte into the comoun vulgar Crede p bileve the holi  
 univerſal Chirche, we ben not taughte as bi ſtrengthe of  
 thilk wordis ſoꝛto bileve othere than this that oon holi uni-  
 verſal Chirche is, and what ſolowith therof. Even as bi  
 lph Articlis of the ſame comoun Crede, bi lph tenour of  
 wordis we ben taugt oon Baptiſm to be, ſoꝛge benes of Synnys  
 to

\* Paphnu-  
tius.

to be, euerlastyng lpf to be; and not bi tho Articlis sozo bi-  
 labe to con Baptim; and sozo bilabe to forgyvenes of Synys,  
 and sozo bileebe to euerlastyng lpf, as schal be schewid bet-  
 tir her aftir in this same II. partie the VIII. Ch. Wherfoze so-  
 lowith that bi the tenour of this Article in the comoun Crede  
 in which and bi which we ben taugt for to bileebe on holi uni-  
 versal Chirche, we ben not taugt sozo bileebe to the holi uni-  
 versal Chirche, that is to seie to bileebe that the holi univer-  
 sal Chirche seith and techith treuthe. So that if we be bounde  
 sozo bileebe to the holi universal Chirche in this now seid un-  
 derstonding, it must rise bi sum othere fundament than bi this  
 Argument in the comoun vulgar Crede, which in thi VIII.  
 Argument thou alleggist. Whi the Article to be bileebed  
 that oon universal Chirche of God is, was putte into the co-  
 moun Crede, schal be sumwhat tretid here aftir in this same  
 II. Parti the VII. Ch. and moze sumwhere ellis in Latyn.  
 Nevertheles schoztli to seie here. Soon aftir the Apostlis ro-  
 sen Heretikis, and summe of them helden that there were dy-  
 verse Chirchis of God on erthe, and that thei were a Chirche  
 of God bi hem self. And for as myche as the grete Fadris  
 in the Chirche hadden abomynacioun herof, thei puttiden in-  
 to the comoun Crede sozo bileebe oon hool universal Chirche  
 to be with hile parties not discoriding oon fro the othere in  
 feith of God. And this is ser fro this for to bileebe nedis to  
 this universal Chirche in alle casis. This is pnow o my Sone  
 here for an answer to thin VIII. principal Argument. Also  
 it is to be understonde that Catholik is as myche to seie as  
 General, and therfoze the Catholik feith is as myche to seie  
 as General and Universal feith, and Catholik Chirche is  
 as myche to seie as General o Universal Chirche. This  
 wole good and trewe grammer, and this wolen oold Doctou-  
 ris of dunte as Ysidir and Bede in ther wrytingis. And alle  
 witti men knowen that tho significaciouns of wordis in La-  
 tyn ougten be take of grammer. Also Orthodoxe is as  
 myche to seie as rigt glorie, o the thing which is worthi  
 rigt glorie: and therfoze al trewe feith, thoug it be parti-  
 culer, ougte be clepid Orthodoxe feith, thoug not ech feith  
 ougt be clepid Catholik feith, and ech trewe feithful particu-  
 ler Chirche ougte be clepid Catholik Chirche, that is to seie  
 General o Universal Chirche. And pitt men now late not  
 weel leerned in Latin and in Grammer, as good weren that  
 thei

thei weren, and as the old Rolle of Grammer brougte forth the men leerned, had brougte into a viciouse use now late bi ignorance of trewe Grammer for to calle a thing Catholik, for that it is Orthodoxe, eue as for defaute of sufficient leernyng in Grammer men bignne forto bryng into use forto seie in Alioquin schozt, where if thei were wel leernyd in Grammer thei wolden sei Alioquin longe. Take alle men whether the Electuarie whiche Nicholas the Phisicien in his Antidotari callith Catholicon is called so for that it is Orthodoxe or for that it is uniuersal. And take also alle men whether the Booke of Iauenssa in Grammer upon the IV. parties of Grammer is callid Catholicon for that it is Orthodoxe, or for that it is uniuersal; and thanne lete alle them be schamed, or at the least lete them amende ther ignorance, whiche clepen the Chirche or Feith Catholik for that it is Orthodoxe or trewe, and not for that it is uniuersal or general.

## CHAP. V.

**F**urdir may the Clergie or al the hool Chirche in erthe make, of the newe eny Article to be Feith, which was not before Feith in it self. Nowe, I woulde thou forgoatist not what is taught in the first parti of the folower to the donet the XI. ch. hou that Feith is takun in II. maners. In oon maner the knowing bi which we knowen the trewe Article, is clepid Feith; and this maner of taking Feith is propre. In an other maner the same trewe Article in it self knowen bi Feith now leid in the first maner, is clepid also Feith. But the seconde maner of cleeping, thoug it be oft used, it is an unpropre maner of cleeping. Ensample herof is this; the knowing with which y knawe that Marie conceived Crist in her maydenhode, is Feith in the first maner of speeche; and the same Treuthe or Article now rehercid and bileebed, which is this, Marie conceived Crist in her Maydenhode, is Feith in the II. maner of speeche. And lyk maner eeh other Article bileebed is wound to be clepid Feith. Thanne se the thus, euer eeh of these maners may be departid into threyn other maners. For whi as it apperith Chap. in the first parti of the folower to the donet, the knowing wherynne y consent in myn undirbonding to a treuthe beynge aboue sure capacite to knawe, save bi therof Goddis affermyng or reveling is Feith.



Feith. And also the knowing wherynne y consent in myn understanding to a treuthe not bi my reasonis fynding, but bi this that a creature, which for good evidencis y troue not therynne to lie, it assermede, is Feith. And so the comoun speche usith to seie, y gave credence to him, he is a credible man, and so forth of othere spechis lph. Wherfore it folowith bi strengthe of the first particioun now bifore seid, that answeringly to these now last seid membris, the Article of the Treuthe knowun bi the first membre of this last particioun is Feith; and the Article of Treuthe knowun bi the II. membre of this particioun is also seid Feith. Fadir, the particiouns of depauntingis of Feith y contayne wel, and y take and compryehende them sufficientli in mitwitte and in myn mynde. Wel Some chaunge seithe thus. Take thou thilk Feith which is a knowing wherynne we consenten in oure understanding to a treuthe being above oure capacite to fynde and knowe, and therefore we knowen it bi this that God it assermyd; and take thou the Feith which is the Article of the Treuthe in this now seid maner knowun, and certis never neither of these II. Feithis the Clergie of the hool Chirche may make of the newe at his owne wil. Forwhi it is not in the power of the Clergie, neither in the power of the hool Chirche for to make such an Article to be trewe or to be untrue; as it is not in the Chirchis power for to make this to be trewe or to be untrue, that Marie conceived a Childe in her mappehede, or this, that Cris was deed and roos agen into lyf, and so forth of othere Articles of Feith in this seid maner and kind. And therefore it that al the Clergie of the hool Chirche may do heraboute, is denouncing and declaring and denyng to the simpler parti of the Chirche what is in ever either of these now last seid maners, and that this is to be take for such seid Feith, and that this othere is to be take for such Feith, and so forth of othere lph. But alle wise men may soone se that for is this no power to make eny thing to be such seid Feith; and that the Chirche makith not a thing to be such Feith in this that he dooreeth, decreeth, iurith, determyneth, and winneth, and publishith a thing to be such a Feith. Beloum wole that the wiser parti of al the hool multitude of Cristen men take upon them for to teche and enforse autoritatively the simpler parti, which thing oughte be take for Feith and which not, and that into greet



alighting and espyng and suring to the simpler parti: and so  
 doith the Clergie to the Lay parti. And of more strengthe  
 than this is, ple not that the Determinacioun of the Chirche  
 is. But agenward take thou feith which is the knowyng  
 wherynne we consenten in oure undirstonding to a treuthe  
 which we spynden not in oure resonyng other wise than for a  
 creature, which for sufficient ebydencis we trowen not ther-  
 ynne to lie, it asseermyde: and take thou the same Treuthe  
 so of us trowid and bileeved, which also is feith: and ever  
 either of these feithis may be maad of new of the Clergie.  
 Forwhi the Clergie may make now first a fastyng day and  
 an Holi day, which never weren bifoze. And of this making  
 and ordinaunce risen up these II. Treuthis which never were  
 bifoze: this day is to be fastid, and this day is to be ha-  
 lowid. Now manpe of the symple peple molwe learne these  
 II. Trowthis of the Clergie, that is to seie, thei molwe learne  
 and knowe that this day is to be fastid, and this day is to be  
 holowid: which thei witen not whi save for this that the  
 Clergie seien so and asseermen so to them. And therfoze it is  
 in the powre of the Clergie to make into them such feith as  
 is now seid. Fadir, this maner of feith whiche the Chirche  
 may make is of noon othere kind, but as is the credence oꝝ  
 feith which ech housholder may make to hise yong Childzen  
 and hise rude and symple Hydes and to his Bondmapdens,  
 and Boond Men not myche witti to resone: and therfoze  
 these feithis whiche the Clergie may make ben fer fro the  
 hignes and worthines of feithis, whiche God to us makith.  
 And therfoze fadir lete us speke her attir, as we had spoken  
 bifoze of tho feithis, whiche we had bi asseermyng of God:  
 for suche ben algatis necessarie to oure helpe. Done p assente  
 wel that we schulen so speke, and therfoze aske therof what  
 thou wolte. Fadir p aske this: owyth the Clergie oꝝ the  
 Chirche bileebe as feith eny Article which is not expresseid in  
 the litteral sence oꝝ undirstonding of holi Scripture; and which  
 is not folowynge out of eny Article in holi Scripture; but  
 if he have soꝝo it bileebe and trowe bi this Argument: what-  
 ever God asseermed oꝝ schewid oꝝ revelid is trewe. This  
 Article God asseermyd oꝝ revelid. Wherfoze this Article  
 is trewe. And but if he have sufficient ebydence for Treuthe  
 of the II. Premeysse, as bi such a Premeysse: whatever the  
 Apostlis oꝝ othere undoutabili trewe heerers of God, oꝝ sum  
 undou-

undoutable myracle, oꝛ sum undoutable inspiracioun, oꝛ sum undoutable appering without forth oꝛ withynne forth to eny persoone, oꝛ sum long uce of bileevyng in the Chirche without eny biggynnyng kneuven therof, witnesid God to have affermyd oꝛ rebelid oꝛ schewid; God it affermed rebelid oꝛ schewid. So it is that the Apostilis oꝛ sum other undoutable credible heerer of God oꝛ sum undoutable myracle oꝛ sum undoutable inspiracioun, oꝛ sum undoutable appeering withynne forth oꝛ without forth, oꝛ sum leid longe uce of bileevyng in the Chirche, witnesid that God affermyd oꝛ rebelid this Article. Wherefoze treuthe is that God affermyd this same Article. And yitt fer ther upon the II. now leid Premysse he muste have notabili likli evydencis in Argument, and so likli that to the contrarie is not hadde, neither hopid to be hadde eny evydence so likli. And sotheli Some, as may ful openli be deducid, if al what is leid of feith in this present Book be weel takun undirstonden and comprehendid, whatever Article the Clergie oꝛ the hool Chirche bileeveth as Feith, and hath not upon the same Article this leid processe of evydence and of prof: he in so bileevyng is over hasti, and usurpith and presumeth ferther than he schulde: and upon whatever Article the Clergie can have the said processe of prof, it the Clergie may bileebe as Feith without perel. And if the Clergie have such a pzeef as now is ensampled upon sum Article not wryten openli in holi Scripture, neither folowynge out of eny Article so wryten, (the Chirche so hath upon these trouthis that this holi lyver after his deeth is acceptid into salvacioun and to be reverencid and woꝛschipid, and folowid as foꝛ a savyd Soule and moche lobyd and woꝛschipid of God, and so of many Martiris, Confessouris and Virgins othere and dyverse fro the personys of the Apostilis: the Chirche hath the now leid prof, and that bi help of Myracilis wel tried and examyned bi sufficient trewe witnessing, oꝛ bi open at fulle schewing. Thoug the Chirche nedith not seche help of Myracilis foꝛ the Apostilis to be doon, and that bicause Crist leid to them: Thus joie and be ye glad, foꝛ your names ben wryten in Hevenes. And thanne therof folowith this to be take foꝛ an Article of Feith: Thomas of Canturbi is a Seint, Joon of Bridlington is a Seint in the said dew undirstonding of this woꝛd Sepnt; and so forth of othere whose lyvynge and foꝛ

Whom the impractis doon be wel examyned and tried bi  
 witnessis thowme notwithstanding that pretende Impractis and  
 pretende Inspiraciouns and pretende Appeeringis of God or  
 of Angells withynne forth and without forth and legends  
 or lybes of Seyntis and othere stozies whiche ben written  
 and hadde in fame, ben ful stider and unsure groundis for  
 to grounde upon them feith, that is to seie, a treuthe pas-  
 sing nature and rebelid bi God, without passing greet trial  
 of them. For certis among them a diligent wise ensercher  
 schal fynde sumtyme Superstitiouns, sumtymes Errouris  
 agens sure knowen Treuthe, sumtyme Heresies agens the  
 feith, and sumtyme contrariete bitwix hem self; as forto  
 putte out in speciall where and how oft, it were ober longe here.  
 And therfore thoug the Chirche suffre manye such to reme-  
 forth and be redde, and be takin as wise men wole jage and  
 sele of them; the Chirche is not so hasty forto determyne  
 autoritativeli them to be trewe. Nevertheless alle tho whiche  
 the Chirche takith into greet and perfigt examinacioun, and  
 ther after jugith and detreeth and determyneeth autentikali  
 to be trewe ben nedis to be take for trewe, in lasse than suf-  
 ficient prof be made into the contrarie, and unto yome thilk  
 prof be maad and knowe, as y seid bifoze in the Ch. of the  
 first parti of this Book. But yite that the Apostlis bitoken  
 not, vnt and vntis holi Scripture enp Articlis uniaizien  
 to be beleved for necessarte feithis, thoug summe men so  
 comounli holben, y may argue bi right notable evidencis,  
 of whiche the first is this. The Apostlis bitoken not to  
 cristen men enp Articlis to be beleved as such seid feith  
 bi enp such wey, which the Apostlis knowen to be no spede-  
 ful and sufficient wey forto in it bitake enp Articlis to be  
 beleved as so greet feith. But so it is that the Apostlis  
 knowen wel that to bitake to the heering and mynde of  
 the peple wouli without writing enp such Articlis wouli  
 be of them beleved was no speedeful and sufficient wey.  
 Wherfore the Apostlis not so bitoken. The II. Premysse  
 of this Argument may in this wise be proved. Thilk  
 wey was wel known considered and aspiid to be insuf-  
 ficient and unspeful, which was bi the Apostlis reme-  
 died and lest and leid aside. But so it was that this seid  
 wey for to helpere enp Articlis as such feith to the peple bi  
 heering and mynde wouli without writing was lest and leid  
 aside

and be remedied bi this that thei wroten the Gospels and  
 Epistlis to the peple. Forwhiellis thei hadden no sufficient  
 cause for to so write. And Luk in his prolog into hise Go-  
 spel meneth the same. Wherfore it folowith, that the seid  
 wey was weel knowin and considered and aspyed to be insuf-  
 ficient for the seid entent to be sufficientli sped. Also the seid  
 second premisse myghte be proved thus: The Apostlis maad  
 so wise bi the holi Gooft forto overte and knowe Scripturis  
 of the oold testament, myghte soon knowe and remembre hou  
 that manye trouthis Adam seide and taughte to hise sones  
 and hise ofspring over it that is wryten in the Bible. Wher-  
 of no man in the tyme of the Apostlis coude eny thing seie:  
 and thilk maner it was knowun of the Apostlis to be trewe  
 that Noe and Abraham seiden and taughten manye trouthis  
 to thei heres not wryten, whiche no man coude reherce in  
 tyme of the Apostlis, and al for that thei were not wryten.  
 And in lpi maner it was trewe of David and of Solomon  
 amentis thei heerers, so that noon of thei wordis be knowun,  
 than thei ben wryten. And if we wolen come neer hoom, soon  
 the Evangelist leithen the last ch. of his Gospel, that mo my-  
 raculis Crist dide, than ben wryten in this Book, which if thei weren  
 wryten, al the world, thoug it were turned into bokis, schulde not  
 take and comprehende. And that of al the myraculis not wry-  
 ten in the Gospels not don is of us now knowun. Wherfore  
 it folowith that so wise men as weren the Apostlis in goodli  
 necessarie maters, and so fulfilled with the holi goost, and  
 also wel putte into good avisys bi ful worti Clerkis con-  
 vertid into Cristen feith knewen well that this wey forto de-  
 hyber necessarie feith to peplis bi word and heering and  
 mynde oonly without that of the wryting was insufficient to  
 the peple. The second evydence is this. If the Apostlis  
 hadden lete renne eny Articlis undir necessarie feith to be bi-  
 leved without prof of the Scripture; this entent and  
 dede of the Apostlis schulde have be better known and  
 holden of the Chirche, which was in tyme of grete Constan-  
 tyn the Empero; than of eny Chirche being after the seid  
 daies. For so it was the Chirche in the daies of Constantyn  
 holde not, trowid not, and considered not, that the Apostlis so  
 left without wryting eny Articlis to be taken as necessarie  
 feith. Wherfore no Chirche after the daies of Constantyn  
 owtiths to holde. The second premisse p may prove thus. In  
 the



the daies of the greet and first Constantyn Emperour there was maad an uniberfal Councell of all Cristen in Nice of Bityne; in which uniberfal Councell was gaderid the Latyn Clerkis and the Greck Clerkis togider for this entent principali to declare the trewe feith in the article upon which Ari errid, and folowingly forto putte out in an expresse Crede the substauncial pointis and articlis of oure feith, as is opene in the stozies clepid ecclesiastich stozie and tripartid stozie, oꝛ ellis thus. The Churchis stozie and the thirde partid stozie : which stozies ben the worthiest and moste credible of eny othere save the Bible. And therfore so thei dide and maad a Crede, which in the seid second book is witten. But so it muste nedis have be that if the Chirche in tho daies hadde knowen oꝛ trowid that the Apostilis had de- lybered to the peple eny articlis undir heering and mynde donli; the Chirche in thilk seid general Councell gaderid for to point and articlee maters of our feith wolden rather have sette forth in witing of the Crede than maad tho seid articlis, which the Apostilis left out of witing, than tho of whom expresse menciuyn is maad in the witing of the Apostilis. And that fer as myche as to the mo nede remedie is rather to be goven than to the lasse nede. And the nede to putte tho Articlis undir witing was ful greet as soone aftir appere. Wherfore the Chirche then gaderid hadde no conceite that the Apostilis leften eny suche Articlis of necessarie feith, which the Apostilis not wroten. And in lph maner as it was in the first seid general Councell of Nice that thei pointiden out Articlis of bileebe to alle Cristen peple into a foorm of a Crede, so dide anothere greet general Councell aftir at Constantynopol, and manpe othere provincial Coun- cels, as apperith in the book clepid Decrees of Counsells re- hercen the II. now seid Credis; and in noon of them so making and pointing Articlis of oure feith in ther credis is men- sionn maad of eny articlis taught bi the Apostilis out of Scri- pture. The III. evydence is this. If eny Article schulde be left to peple fro the Apostilis undir heering and mynde to be holde and bileeved of the peple greet as feith, these pointis and articlis schulde be tho rather than othere, oꝛ as soon as othere; that is to scie : we schulen prie toward the Cest, we schulen blesse us with a cros, Prestis schulen make tre soold crosseis upon the bzede and wyne offride in the auter bitoze the consecratioun,



consecracioun, the font of baptim schal be blessed with oile, and baptisid persoons schulen be anointed with oile. But so it is that ech of the seid governauncis takun ther biggynnyng and ordinaunce of oure Fadirs oonli not the Apostlis bi a chapiter of holi Basile in the summe of Gracian, Dist. XI. c. Ecclesiasticorum. And in the same wise it is to be demed of holi water, whom Alisaundir the first and Pope ordeynyd. And of holi byede and of the moost parti of observaciouns in the Masse, and of the fasting Lent, and of manye othere suche observaciouns, whom alle holi Fadirs sithen the Apostlis ordeynyd, and as it appereth by opene witnessing of wrytings. Wherefore it is not to be holde that eny othere observaciouns or articlis dyvers fro these now reherryd the Apostlis bitoke without wryting to be kept and to be bileeved as such seid greet feith. Also holi Basile the now bifoze alleggid c. in the summe of Gracian, c. XI. Ecclesiasticorum, departith tho thingis whiche alle Cristen owen to holde and to bileeve into III. membris, that is to seie, into thingis pointis or articlis, which to us leuith and bitakith apostolik ordinaunce, that is to seie, ordinaunce of a Pope, or of Popes, which to us bitaketh holi Scripture, and which to us bitaketh devoute uce cholen of the mo part of the peple. Wherefore holi Basile conceived no mo membris than these III. to be nedis takun and kept of Cristen peple: and thanne folowith that he conceyved not such a fourth membre to be takun and kept of the peple, that is to seie, whiche the Apostlis taugten and lesten and bitoken for substantial feith without wryting. And that bi the first notwe reherryd membre Basile undirstood Popis ordinauncis it is likli therfore: Forwhi the ordinauncis of Popis benful famous and moze famous and moze reverente attendaunce in the comoun peple than is the custum and usage of the comoun peple, or at the leest of and even so myche. Wherefore it is likli that Basile left not Popis ordinauncis unspeakun of in his particioun bifoze seid. But othere it is that he speke not of Popis ordinauncis, but if he speak thereof in the first membre of the seid particioun. Wherefore it is trewe, that he so speke. And so fynally forto seie into the principal entent of this present chapiter, I am not ware that the Chirche techis or despyerith eny thing to be sucha seid catholic feith as a treuthe doon or taught in toun of Crist or

of the Apostles, exceptis which is contempned expressly in  
the writingis of the newe testament or following wof in for-  
mer argument. If any other man kan remembre him of  
othere or of his, wel be it. But yitt thingis doon or taught  
longe after tyme of the Apostles the Church may determyne  
for such seid feith, thongh not as a treuthe doon or taught  
or revealed bi God in the tyme of Crist or of the Apostles,  
But latre after the tyme of Crist and of the Apostles: among  
whiche thingis declared bi the Church for feith not contem-  
pned expressely or impressely in holi Scripture, if any such  
be, p remembre me now, save of it what is before  
seid in this seid chapter tounge to the ransoming of sinners.  
And that if any such be, which condicoun p seie for pe-  
cunniere it may be sold and redicouned wel, that the Church  
intendith not to take and dedecoun and publish this  
to be an article of such seid feith, Thomas of Cantuar is a  
seint, John of Bridlington is a seint, Ambrose is a seint, and  
so of othere Iohannes dyvers seint Marie, and so the Apostles in  
the newe testament, But the Church admyttith and allowith  
them to be holde and respected and folowed for seintis in al,  
or in anye thing taught or doon bi them, Cellis people shalbe  
not counsell to do, as the Church hereth not or determyne  
neither publishith the writingis of Ambros, of Jerom, of An-  
styn to be read, but admittis them to be take in use of he-  
ring, and of reading and heering with freedom to seeke of  
them whateys shalbe reasonabli and sufficient more in  
some thingis whiche writingis shalben not ellis holden  
and counsell to take and such reading, reading and heering  
as thei now ben take, so were the seid admyssion doon upon  
them bi the Church, even as the Church repelleth and wermeth  
the writingis of him othere wryters to be take into use of  
reading and heering counsell, of which both debis doon bi  
pope Gelasi mentounis maad in the tynne of Gracian Dist.  
XV. Sancta Romana, and therfore thongh p took not excha-  
nge for him what helping was the grounding mynistris and re-  
velacounis and longe use of blessing in the Church, name-  
lych which may be in longe use of understanding thus or  
thus holi Scripture, as for his literal sence yitt thei ben  
yet ful sover in him all for to found the seid feith, but he be  
sufficiently proved and tried. And furthermore it seemeth that  
the Apostles intended not for to give any catholick feith  
necessarie

necessarie to Cristen Menmys satisfacion bi word onli to be kept  
 without wryting and remembraunce, and so bi al that is wryten fro  
 the biggmen of this present chapitre hider to, it semeth that the  
 Clergie ougte not induce oꝝ conscreyne the othere peple into bi-  
 liebe and feith of othere pointis and articlis as upon the feith  
 of whom is hangen oure saluacion than ben exprestid in the li-  
 teral sence of holi Scripture, oꝝ following them so exprestid. **O**  
**Fadir**, pam mych delitid in pour so wise and depe forth leeding of the  
 seid now bifoze goyng proffis. **Neuertheles** y truste so moche in  
 poure to me good fadirhood that ye wole suffre me make agens  
 pour doctrine this now to solowe objection. **Don** of the best Clerkis  
 and wisist Dying and clepid therfoze the Doctour Butel Scoor,  
 seith in his wryting that this article Crist in his deith of bodi discer-  
 did into hellis is an article of necessarie feith. And that for as myche  
 as it is putte in the comoun crede, whiche crede is ascrib'd to haue be  
 maad of the Apostlis, and yitt this same article, as he seith, is not  
 groundid in holi Scripture. **Wherfoze** poure doctryne standith not,  
 if this Doctour was not in this his newe seide sentence bigilid. **O**  
**Sone**, he berith him ful wel which is never bigilid, namelich if he  
 wryte myche oꝝ teche myche. For as holi Scripture seith in myche  
 spechis defaut is not wanting. But that the seid Doctour was  
 in this conceit bigilid, so y may schewe thus. In the tyme of  
 Austyn and of othere holi Clerkis aboute Austyns tyme the co-  
 moun crede hadde not withynne him this seid article: Crist in  
 his deeth of bodi descendid to hellis, as y prove in the booke of  
 feith in Latyn. And no man may seie that the Apostlis settiden  
 thilk article in the comoun crede, a this side the daies of Apostlis.  
**Wherfoze** nedis it is trewe that neither bifoze neither after Austyns  
 daies the Apostlis settiden thilk article into the comoun crede. And  
 so the grounde foundemente and cause whi the seid Doctour held  
 the seid article to be a feith is not trewe, that is to seie, that  
 the Apostlis puttiden thilk article into the comoun crede. and that  
 the kirke may make noon such article of feith, is bifoze schetwid in of  
 this present chapitre the forheed. That in the tyme of Austyn and of  
 othere holi fadris about Austyns tyme the comoun crede had not  
 this seid article it is opene bi diuerse and manye omelies and  
 expoficiouns, which Austyn and the othere seid fadris maden,  
 expowning the comoun crede in ther daies remynig. And that  
 fro article to article bi and bi fro the first unto the last, and thei  
 leaven unspokun of the now seid article. And also thei over-  
 leepen this article. *Cetera desunt.*

# An Alphabetical TABLE of the more *Obsolete English Words* to be found in the Treatise, with their Significations.

**A**gens, } against.  
Aghe, }  
Agenble, redeem.  
Agens metith, opposeth.  
Aggatis, in all respects.  
Aggting, facilitating.  
Agentis, concerning.  
Agnoon, presently.  
Apocryphis, Apocryphal.  
Apower, able.  
Ari, Arius.  
Assold, refused.  
At this side, since.  
Ater, Altar.  
Avisable, deliberate.  
Avisement, deliberation.

**B**.  
Bede, commanded.  
Beneficis, benefits.  
Berith, behaveth.  
Bi, by.  
Biselle, besel.  
Bisknows, acknowledgeth.  
Bilebe, beliefe.  
Birden, burden.  
Birted, burred.  
Biss, bulsie.  
Bistids, besides.  
Bistaken, } delivered.  
Bistooke, }  
Boondis, contents.  
Boonys, gifts, graces.  
Brennyng, burning.  
Bzent, burnt.  
Buidingis, commands.

**C**.  
Cast hym, set himself.  
Certis, certainly.  
Chargeose, expensive.  
Chauncis, accidents.  
Chefir, superior.  
Cespid, called.  
Comberose, cumbersome.  
Combze, loud.  
Comonute, society.  
Conicacioun, examination.  
Coude, could.  
Courself, hastily.

**D**.  
Deed, dead.  
Deeme, judge.  
Dehene, Deacon.  
Demed, considered.  
Departid, divided.  
Departith, divideth.  
Dexer, due.  
Disencion, dissention.  
Dooome, judgment.  
Dougten, doubtful.  
Dowte, doubt.  
Dressing, bearing.  
Dunte, fame.  
Durid, lasted.  
Dwelliden, dwelt.  
Dymme, dim.

**E**.  
Ellis, else.  
Ennok, Enoch.  
Eny, any.  
Erthe, earth.

Esit, easily.  
Ebene, equal.  
Expowne, expound.

**F**.  
Fadir, father.  
Fadris, fathers.  
Feende, devil.  
Felle, happened.  
Fer, far.  
Ferthe, forth.  
Fier, fire.  
Finucius, Paphnutius.  
Following, consequence.  
Followingit, consequently.  
Forehed, foregoing part.  
Foundement, foundation.  
Fro, from.

**G**.  
Gede, went.  
Gendrid, born.  
Gookit, spiritual.  
Gobun, given.  
Grete, great.  
Groundell, fundamentally.  
Groundier, firmer.  
Grow in, intervene.

**H**.  
Hadde, had.  
Han, have.  
Hangement, hanging.  
Hau, have.  
Heed, head.  
Heere, hear.  
Hemself, themselves.



# TABLE.

Her, their.  
 Herden, heard.  
 Here that, whereth.  
 Heres, heirs.  
 Hige, high.  
 Hise, his.  
 Holde, hold.  
 Holi, holy.  
 Hondis, hands.  
 Hool, whole.  
 Hyte, company.

## I.

Igen, eyes.  
 Impresseth, implicitly.  
 Ion, } John.  
 Ioon, }  
 Iugis, Judges.

## K.

Kinde, nature.  
 Kindell, natural or ordinary.  
 Kirke, Church.  
 Kunne, can.  
 Kunning, knowledge.  
 Kuntre, country.

## L.

Leedir, more willing.  
 Lefingis, lies.  
 Lettris, letters.  
 Liggist, lyeth.  
 Likil, likely.  
 Litil, little.  
 Longid to, belonged.  
 Lpt, like.  
 Lpt, like.  
 Lpyng, living.

## M.

Maad, made.  
 Mannys, many.  
 Maxie, male.  
 Mede, Salvation.  
 Mennys, mens.  
 Mentoun, mention.  
 Mete agens, oppose.  
 Mo, more.

Moche, much.  
 Moncy, many.  
 More, greater.  
 Mozewe, morrow.  
 Mowe, may.  
 Myche, much.  
 Mygte, power.  
 Mykten, might.  
 Myngstriden, administred.  
 Myraculus, miraculous.

## N.

Namelich, natnely.  
 Ne, neither.  
 Nede, necessity.  
 Nedis, necessarily.  
 Ni laste, unless.  
 Noon, none.  
 Notabill, notably.  
 Noombze, number.  
 Nuylling, nulling.

## O.

Omeites, Homilies.  
 Oold, old.  
 On, one.  
 Donit, only.  
 Onys, once.  
 Openli, manifestly.  
 Othe, other.  
 Overer, superiours.  
 Owen, ought.

## P.

Pacchis and cloutis, addi-  
 tions.  
 Parischens, Parishioner.  
 Paste, Paschever.  
 Peres mele, piecemeal.  
 Perfut, perfect.  
 Persoonys, persons.  
 Physicien, Physician.  
 Poultis, Pauls.  
 Prechiden, preached.  
 Pzempsis, propositions.  
 Pretense, pretended.  
 Prie, pray.  
 Privy, private.

Procelle, passage.  
 Proficied, prophesied.  
 Prologis, prologues.  
 Publischid, published.  
 Purbeied, provided.

## R.

Radde, read.  
 Reclimed, opposed.  
 Redi, ready.  
 Releef and retrail, poorer  
 and meaner fort.  
 Renne, run.  
 Rensyng, running or cur-  
 rant.  
 Rennyng herewith, concu-  
 ring to it.  
 Resoned, learned.  
 Resoun, reason.  
 Reule, rule.  
 Rewine, room.  
 Rightwisnesse, justice.  
 Roos, rose.  
 Ronte, multitude.

## S.

Saaf, safe.  
 Sad, grave.  
 Sadnesse, gravity.  
 Sate the cause, solve the  
 question.  
 Scant, scarce.  
 Schai, shall.  
 Schapide, prepared.  
 Sche, she.  
 Schewe, shew.  
 Schipp, ship.  
 Schope, intended or ordered.  
 Schortil, shortly.  
 Schotte, slew.  
 Schuide, should.  
 Scoule, school.  
 Se, see.  
 Seche, seek.  
 Seie, say.  
 Sevbage, bondage.  
 Settid, resolved.  
 Settiden, placed.



## TABLE

[illegible]

# ENIGMA

